The Shakespeare Newsletter

VOL. V, NOS. 5 - 6 *"Knowing I lov'd my books, he furnish'd me . . ."* Nov. - Dec., 1955

Conference On Theatre History: London, 1955

In commenting on The International Conference on Theatre History held at London from July 17 to July 23, Roy Walker elaborated on theatrical history as it influenced the present.

German and French Views

The Germans had declared that the influence should be slight, that the theatre is "first and foremost creative work," that the "creative artist works primarily from his soul not from his mind," and that the "artist follows laws other than those of the scholars." The French declared that the opposite was true with them and that the current renaissance in the French theatre was founded on the past sixty years of research. "The choice of repertories, the spirit and style of the performance, the evolution of methods of production, are, in a broad sense, tributaries of these researches. . . . [as are] the evolution of ideas on the architecture of the theatre auditorium."

Producing Classical Plays

In the English theatre, the problem is acute when the question of producing classical or renaissance plays is being considered. Richard Southern declared himself an all-out advocate of "the Elizabethan-style, non-scenic, open stage" for Shakespeare. Norman Marshall declared that fights were effective on the open stage but not soliloquies - "if the actor happens to have his back to the place where you are sitting."

Mr. Walker does not think that Granville-Barker - by whom so many producers still swear - had a monopoly of wisdom about the interpretation and staging of Shakespeare," but that he did make effective use of research. Nor does Mr. Walker think that "Sir John Gielgud would necessarily be a better actor if he had as it were, Burbage breathing down his neck." Nevertheless, future producers will have it easier because they will have technicolor films, recordings, and photographs for historical reference. ". . .the familiar platitudes about the ephemeral nature of theatrical art, the fading of the insubstantial pageant of the stage" is disappearing slowly. (Mr. Walker's comments were addressed to a B. B. C. audience and printed in *The Listener,* Aug. 18, 1955.)

Rare Shakespeareana Exhibited

The Pierpont Morgan Library in New York (29 East 36th Street) reserved a place of honor for Shakespeare in its "English Literature from Chaucer to Shakespeare" exhibition. Two or more copies of each Folio are shown representing variant issues of importance. Also on exhibition are sixteen quartos of the plays and poems. The exhibition will be on display until December 30.

ASFTA Heads Plan Great '56 Season

With the appointment of Joseph Verner Reed as new President of the American Shakespeare Festival Theatre and Academy and the formulation of a new policy, the Company is expected to "make Americans proud with the next season's production." This statement by Ethel Beckwith (honorary member of the Festival Board) of the *Bridgeport* [Connecticut] *Herald,* is followed by the comment that a new play director is also being sought.

Mr. Lawrence Langner originator of the project and head of the Theatre Guild remains as Chairman of the Board.

Plans to bring the English Stratford-upon-Avon Company to the U. S. as guests of the ASFTA are being made. "Should the parleys terminate successfully," says a *New York Times* report, "the British troupe will be seen at Stratford during the summer of 1957" in *Richard II,* 1 and 2 *Henry IV,* and *Henry V.* A subsequent road tour is planned. This apparently supersedes the plan to bring the Company here in 1956.

Meanwhile the Connecticut theatre has been opened for free inspection to the hundreds of interested visitors who drive to the park site daily.

Brattle Shakespeare Co. Has Successful Season

Three plays were staged with unusual success by the Brattle Shakespeare Company at Cambridge, Massachusetts, from July 5 to August 27. About 17,000 saw the plays.

So popular was *I Henry IV* that a third week was added to the two originally scheduled. *Othello* played to standing - room audiences that packed the 350 seat theatre. The third play, *Much Ado,* was given a most lavish setting in a Spanish home, (during the Napoleonic invasion), with a realistic fountain. Bryant Haliday and Michael Wager were co-producers for the season. Most of the actors were Harvard graduates.

Othello and *I Henry IV* were subsequently taken to New York for a month at the City Center. *Othello* was directed by John Stix and *IHIV* by Jerome Kilty who took the parts of Falstaff and Iago.

Renaissance Conference in Louisiana

Announcement that The Fifth Annual South - Central Renaissance Conference will be held on April 13-14, 1956, was made by Waldo F. McNeir of Louisiana State University. Lectures, books, prints and drawings, a musical program, and a production of *Volpone* are scheduled. Papers in the field should be submitted to Kester Svendsen of the University of Oklahoma no later than January 15th.

Memorial Theatre Breaks All Records

Stratford-upon-Avon's star-studded 96th Season broke all previous records by entertaining approximately 375,000 in its thirty - three week season from April 12 to November 25. In 1953 the attendance was 365,000; in 1954, 353,000.

The five play season included *12th Night, All's Well,* the *Merry Wives, Titus Andronicus,* and *Macbeth* Among the cast were Sir Lawrence and Lady Olivier (Vivien Leigh), Anthony Quayle, Angela Baddeley, Joyce Redman, William Devlin, and Rosalind Atkinson. So successful were the plays that for three of the eight months each of the seats could have been sold four times over. About a million people had applied for seats.

Titus a hit

The plays were widely praised. *Titus Andronicus,* remarkably, proved to be the hit of the season. Bone - crunching sound affects brought groans from the audience when Titus "cut off" his hand. In one performance the macabre incidents perpetrated by "sadistic psychopaths" saused twelve persons to be carried from the theatre unconscious. Others left the theatre and complaints poured in. (In 1923 when Old Vic did *Titus,* something was considered wrong with the performance if fewer than ten fainted.)

A Stratford critic declared that director Peter Brook had brought the play "out of the limbo of juvenilia into the memorable realm of masterpiece." The Oliviers starred in the production.

A three week run of the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre touring company under the leadership of Sir John Gielgud opened following the regular season on November 28. *Much Ado* (15 curtain calls in Vienna) and *King Lear* (see page 34) are on the program.

Excellent photographs of these productions may be found in the July and September issues of London *Theatre World.*

Canada Plans Fourth Festival

Michael Langham, the new Artistic Director of the Stratford Shakespearean Festival has announced that *Henry V* will be one of the plays at the fourth Festival in 1956. A group of French speaking actors from Quebec will be featured in the play.

The growing prestige of the Festival is revealed by invitations to bring the Company to New York where it will open at the Alvin Theatre on January 25, and to the Edinburgh Festival in Scotland where it will perform after the 1956 season. Because of the latter invitation, it is likely that the nine-week season next year will begin and end a week earlier than usual. June 18 to August 18 are the tentative dates planned.

Achieving Its Goals

Commenting on the honors, President A. M. Bell of the Canadian Festival declared that "In three seasons we have gone far toward achieving . . . the aim of advancing the development of Canadian Theatre and of providing improved opportunities for Canadian acting talent. It is just as important," continued Mr. Bell, "that the Festival work toward establishing a national standard abroad." The tours are a step in that direction.

London's Old Vic Continues Five Year Plan

A *Julius Caesar* directed with "great vigor" by Mr. Michael Benthall and outstandingly performed by a fine company opened the Old Vic season on September 7.

Continuing its five year plan to produce the Folio plays of Shakespeare, the Old Vic Company is following the opening play with a repertory of *The Merry Wives* (Sept. 7, directed by Douglas Seale), *Winter's Tale* (Nov. 1, directed by Mr. Benthall), *Henry V* (with Richard Burton as guest star), *Troilus and Cressida,* and *Othello.*

Wide Audiences Entertained

After the last season ended on June 11, the Company took *Macbeth* and *As You Like It* to the Opera House at Belfast and then to the Olympia Theatre in Dublin. Before the current *Julius Caesar* opened in London it was presented in Liverpool, Swansea, and at the Edinburgh Festival.

To meet rising costs the price of the best seats has been raised to 12/6d ($1.75).

Sixteen excellent photos of the *J. C.* production appear in the October issue of *Theatre World* (London).

Seventh International Shakespeare Conference

Thirty - nine scholars from seven nations convened in Stratford-upon-Avon from Sept. 4 to Sept. 9, for the 7th International Shakespeare Conference. Members heard ten papers on the Roman plays and other subjects and saw four plays. The conference was organized in 1946 and was annual until 1949. Since 1951 it has been a biennial affair. A complete report is begun in the current issue of *SNL.* The program was organized by Professor Allardyce Nicoll and J. R. Brown of The Shakespeare Institute.

13th Annual Renaissance Conference

The University of South Carolina will be host to the 13th annual Renaissance Meeting in the Southeastern States on Friday and Saturday, April 20-21.

Interested persons, including graduate students, are invited to contribute to the program. Papers on any phase of Renaissance culture will be considered. Submit contributions to Hennig Cohen, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.

Season's Greetings To All

Sound and Fury Signifying Something:

or Critical Principles for Shakespeare Directors

In his dressing room several years ago Laurence Eustrel told us that the collective decision of the New York critics resulted in the closing of his $40,000 production of *Much Ado* after a run of only four days. Other Broadway productions have lost even greater amounts of money (Cf. *SNL*, II:5:18). The critics have been blamed for those too. It is probable that another 20,000 would have gone to see the first American Shakespeare Festival at Stratford, Connecticut, if the critics had been pleased with the performances. Word of mouth sometimes belies the critics, but it is extremely rare. Critics *do* have principles and producers frequently worry as much about them as they do about the play.

It is for this reason that we find two reviews of Donald L. Goldman's production of *Macbeth* at the Jan Hus Auditorium in N. Y. C. especially interesting because they reveal the factors that apparently please two of the most respected drama critics in the city of New York.

Brooks Atkinson of *The New York Times* found the play "stimulating" and doubted that anyone would be bored. "A young, healthy company with vigorous voices rushes through the tragedy with a hop, skip, jump and a lot of shouting." The actors are able, and "succeed in doing what they intend." Costumes are rough and unembellished; the lighting is dramatic.

Nevertheless, on the debit side, we find Mr. Atkinson noting that "the company doesn't bother much with poetry or refinement. . . .The play is stripped to the size of a melodrama. . . .the drunken porter misses most of the humor. . . . Not only the poetry but most of the tragic beauty is shouted out of countenance . . . [death of the unheroic Macbeth] becomes an incident rather than a tragedy. The drama lacks roundness, depth and mass, and the narrative becomes scrappy. . . .A good deal of the dialogue is unintelligible, it is shouted at such speed by actors who are racing toward the final curtain. . . .Hitting the top notes consistently paralyzes the audience's responses."

That these are serious flaws is readily admitted by Mr. Atkinson. There should have been scenes of contrasting key. But to this Dean of newspaper critics, *"Dullness is the most implacable foe of Shakespeare. Pretentiousness is the common sin. . .and there is none of either in this Macbeth."* (The italics are ours.)

The comments of Walter F. Kerr of the *New York Herald Tribune* are similar. The briskness, loudness, "violent melodrama," and "unembarrassed enthusiasm," are praised. The company is not "afraid of the fact that it is dealing with verse, with a classic, with the awesome Bard himself. . . .They get to the heart of a scene with the fewest possible flourishes, they dawdle not over a lyrical line. . . .Every word is intelligible. . . .Certain images leap to remarkably fresh life." Neither does Mr. Kerr worry that the Porter scene is "lame," that Pernell Roberts "has not yet the maturity to shape [Macbeth's] conscience," that Mel Dowd "isn't quite clear about Lady Macbeth's motives," and that "a fair amount of the play's incidental psychology is swept aside. . . ."

Mr. Kerr finds that Shakespeare fares better with a bare stage, spare costumes, virtual absence of properties (a laundry bucket is used for the witches' cauldron). Yet, with such virtues and such limitations, "the play itself moves toward us with a directness, a boldness, and a clarity that it hasn't had in years."

It would seem then, that a lively production is more desirable than one that is psychologically sound, rhythmically spoken, maturely acted, and artistically mounted. Certainly the absence of these desirable features was no bar to the praise of the performance.

We wonder whether this is "American" Shakespeare and would the English find us calloused for accepting it? We wonder too would Lawrence Langner (Managing Director of the ASFTA) and Anthony Quayle (Managing Director of the Stratford Memorial Theatre) get away with similar productions on their great stages? We doubt it, and infer as much from comments made by both Messrs. Atkinson and Kerr. We saw *Othello* and *Twelfth Night* performed by these Shakespearewrights and found them quite palatable in their basement auditorium setting. But what would have been their fate had they and this *Macbeth* been produced on Broadway? That, indeed, is a question to be asked.

Obviously, we have a double standard of criticism. It may be that this is what hurts the big producer when he is panned even though his company achieves a level of excellence in some areas that is not even expected in semi-professional companies.

Theatre in Decline?

In a Stratford-upon-Avon debate on the motion "That the days of the living theatre are numbered," a Miss Julia Lang declared that "American - type publicity and the public's reliance on critics had rung the death knell of the professional theatre in England." She further declared that "the death - blow to the theatre came 60 years ago, when Henry Irving was knighted. With this knighthood the career of an actor and actress was no longer disrespectable and hundreds of young children were encouraged to take to the stage as a means of livelihood, with the result that the theatre became overcrowded with mediocre talent."

One of her opponents pointed out that in England before the war there were 20 repertory companies whereas today there were 115.

The Shakespeare Newsletter
Published at Pembroke, North Carolina
Editor & Publisher
LOUIS MARDER
Department of English
PEMBROKE STATE COLLEGE
Pembroke, North Carolina
Six issues annually—Feb., April, May, Sept., Nov., Dec.—Annual Subscription $1.00
Entered as Second Class Matter at the Post Office, Pembroke, North Carolina
Vol. V, Nos. 5-6 Nov.,-Dec., 1955

King Lear with a Difference

A "storm of controversy" was aroused by George Devine's "experimental" production of *King Lear* taken on tour by the Shakespeare Memorial Theatre company under the leadership of Sir John Gielgud. So striking were the settings and costumes designed by American-Japanese sculptor Isamu Noguchi that many critics condemned the staging while leaving the interpretation of the play "practically unnoticed." Some critics lauded the daring production. The program tells the audience that the "object of this production has been to find a setting and costumes which would be free of historical or decorative association so that the timeless, universal and mythical quality of the story may be clear." No stunt was intended. Although the press objected strongly, capacity crowds flocked to see the play which appears to have been influenced by the "spaceman" programs on TV. Holes in the cloak which get progressively larger until no cloak is left symbolize the fall of Lear. (Pictures of the production may be seen in the September issue of *Theatre World* and the August 8 issue of *Life*.

Folio Gift Offer

By arrangement with the Yale University Press, the Book-of-the-Month Club is now distributing copies of the *First Folio* facsimile free with each new membership.

The Shakespeare Institute

Publication of the lectures sponsored by the Shakespeare Institute as an annual *SNL* feature prompts us to remember the important scholarship the Institute has stimulated since its establishment as an extension of the University of Birmingham in 1951. With excellent facilities for research in Shakespeare, Elizabethan literature, and drama, the Institute attracts students and visitors from a wide area both to listen to the Spring and Summer lectures and to attend the Institute for higher degrees.

University of Birmingham degrees are offered as follows: An M. A. "by examination" requires full time attendance during three terms, or part time during six, and five examination papers of which two are on Shakespeare. An M. A. "by dissertation" has similar attendance requirements in addition to a dissertation after two qualifying examination papers in Shakespeare. Candidates for the Ph. D. study for two years (six terms) and write a dissertation.

The three school terms for the 1955-6 year run from Oct. 10 to Dec. 17; Jan. 9 to March 17; and April 23 to June 30. Complete tuition fees (tuition, registration, examination, etc.) total about $140 for the M. A. and $280 for the Ph. D. Room and board are additional. Visiting students may attend any single term for $28. (Cf. other details in *SNL*, IV: 4:28.)

Reveiw of Periodicals:

The Epiphany of Coriolanus

Pursuing the suggestion of Mark Van Doren that the movement of *Coriolanus* is rhetorical, Leonard F. Dean of the University of Connecticut anatomizes "one of the play's deep-seated structural patterns," beginning with "a fairly simple opposition between *voice and deed*," deepening "into the metaphor of play-acting," and finally being absorbed "into the image of the human scene as viewed by the gods." In this "last form it enlarges the epiphany of Coriolanus and helps to establish the play's mode of irony." The pattern as described begins with the dramatization of "Plutarch's basic dilemma," the counter-pointing of "honesty-arrogance-civility-dissimulation." Professor Dean's analysis traces the sequence of "mimetic postures" of striking and kneeling involved in this conflict between voice and deed which deepens in III. ii. "into the metaphor of play-acting" where both are felt by Coriolanus to be a disguise of honest instinct. Unable to carry over into action the formula of Volumnia and Meninius of identifying honor and policy and thus "kneeling" in words for expedient ends, Coriolanus, confusing magnanimity with "solitariness," closes with Aufidius. "The mimetic action of kneeling" now controls the pattern. And when Coriolanus is finally driven by his mother's kneeling to kneel himself, the "circle of defective values" is "once more completed." For at this point Coriolanus views his very integrity as a mimetic role, and his "vision is enlarged to coincide with interpretation of life presented by the whole play": "an epitome of the unnatural world in which there is no promise that voice and deed, appearance and reality, will ever be reconciled as they are in pure tragedy or comedy." ["Voice and Deed in *Coriolanus*," *The University of Kansas City Rev.*XXI:3 (Spring 1955), 177-184.]

The Badness of a Doubtful Quarto

Rejecting "the fundamental assumption" that "when a quarto is known to have been used as basis or copy for the First Folio text," only *one* physical quarto (single or composite) or copy was "used by authority," Andrew S. Cairncross examines the case of *King Lear* and analyzes the evidence for a two-quarto hypothesis explained away by Daniel, offering an hypothesis to account for this evidence. Professor Cairncross' hypotheses is that *F* followed alternately *Q*1 and *Q*2, that the editor was correcting in advance of the compositor on one quarto, " and handing it to the compositor while he proceeded to correct the other" quarto. The hypothesis, if true, points "to the bad rather than to the 'doubtful' status of the quarto text" of *Lear*. ["The Quartos and the Folio Text of *King Lear*," *The Review of English Studies*, N.S.VI:23 (July 1955), 252-258.]

★ Summer Lectures At The Shakespeare Institute ★

The following are abstracts of twenty-four lectures given in six series of four each at the Summer School of The Shakespeare Institute in Stratford-upon-Avon from July 4 to August 11. They were especially prepared for SNL by Dr. Ronald Gross of Syracuse University at the request of Professor John R. Brown of The Shakespeare Institute.

The Major Tragedies:

A study of the human values, Elizabethan and universal, in "Hamlet," "Macbeth," "Othello," and "King Lear."

C. J. Sisson, The Shakespeare Institute

Insisting that "every production is of necessity an interpretation," Prof. Sisson highlighted a central element in each of the great tragedies, suggesting approaches which neither over-simplified each complex whole by searching for a "fatal flaw" in the hero's character, nor distorted the basic human relationships in the quest for image and symbol.

Tracing the theme of justice through the tragedies, Prof. Sisson described the tension in *Hamlet* between justice and revenge, a tension which the hero, as rightful king and therefore dispenser of justice, must resolve before he can act against Claudius. In *Macbeth* we see the results of submission to evil on two fundamentally good characters, and Prof. Sisson pointed up the deeper tragedy of their separation. Macbeth grows more and more inward as his crimes multiply, and the former marital intimacy of husband and wife is glimpsed continually during their downfall. In *Othello* Prof. Sisson found profound resemblances with the theme of justice in *Hamlet.* Iago seeks the "wild justice" of revenge, and Othello, in killing Desdemona, calls upon justice to sanctify his "sacrifice." When he finally knows the truth he realized that he is doomed to hell. In *King Lear* we find the theme of justice given its final tragic statement. Lear, as the king, embodies justice, and his sanity gives way when he begins to doubt its validity. But in the end the triumph of love is more significant than the question of justice. "Report me and my cause aright," asks Hamlet; "All causes must give way," cries Macbeth; "It is the cause, it is the cause, my soul," thinks Othello; but Cordelia, reunited in her love, can ask for "No cause, no cause."

Shakespeare's Political Plays

L. C. Knights, University of Birmingham

The basic question which Prof. Knights finds Shakespeare exploring in the history plays is: What does political action mean in human terms? Rather than settling issues, they enrich our thinking about political problems by placing them in their complex human setting, exemplified by the ironical "close-up" technique used to expose the hypocrites in the coronation scene of *Richard III. King John* presents a contrast between the conventional world of international politics and the local world of complete realism and the forthright comment in the diction and attitude of the bastard. Prof. Knights related this outlook to the social structure of the Elizabethan parish, where the workings of society were exposed in their essentials.

In 1 *Henry IV* we find a "quasi-morality pattern still discernible," but Shakespeare is dramatizing the results of meeting force with force. In the second part we find the new theme of mutability pointing towards the tragedies. In *Henry V* Shakespeare's attitude towards the popular hero is complex and critical as he reveals the inherent contradictions in the condition of kingship which make the moral problems insoluble by purely political success.

In the Roman histories, Prof. Knights explained the dominant tension of public and private life which refutes any attempt to make the political realm independent. In *Julius Caesar* the barrenness of purely political action is emphasized in the unreality which results from abstracting the political from the human. With the experience of the tragedies behind him, Shakespeare presents in *Coriolanus* the human conflict of life values versus the abstractions of honor and renown. The inhumanity of war is expressed through action and imagery, and contrasted with the ideal of organic unity in the state. The disease in the body politic is rooted in the failure of harmony, balance, and integration in the individual.

Elizabethan Ballads

A Side-light on Elizabethan Life & Literature

Allardyce Nicoll, The Shakespeare Institute

In a survey of ballad writing from the beginning of Elizabeth's reign to the start of the Civil War, Prof. Nicoll showed how this relatively unexplored source throws light on various aspects of popular tastes and interests.

No simple definition will cover the field of Elizabethan Ballads, Prof. Nicoll pointed out, and therefore it is best to define them simply as black letter broadside literature. Since the style of the ballads changed rapidly from 1558-1640 it is possible to date them by internal evidence. The early ballads were short and simple, and of a courtly and cultural type. Many deal with the rebellion by Northhumberland in favor of Mary Queen of Scots in 1569-70. The subject matter generally included such diverse topics as dress, pride, usury, landlords, hospitality, and especially lamentations for the Golden Age when good things existed. About a third of the ballads are thus piously dreary, describing a dismal present while expressing faith in Elizabeth and a bright future.

To compute the relative frequency of various subjects in the ballads, Prof. Nicoll used the Stationer's Register which contains the names and subject of over 300 ballads, only 80 of which are extant. He found that the corpus of ballads still available reveal substantially the same ratios of various subjects, and we can therefore be fairly certain that we have a representative collection to work from. In conclusion, Prof. Nicoll recommended further study of this fruitful source of illumination of Shakespeare's work and time.

The Coherence of Shakespeare

A study of those features of the plays which make them mutually self - explanatory

J. F. Danby, University College of North Wales

Describing the various unities which we may perceive in Shakespeare's work, Prof Danby defined the unity of the individual work of art, that of a writer's total *corpus,* the "congruence" of his work with others of his generation, the unity of continuous "tradition" which links his time with ours, and the unity with eternal truth which makes him timeless. Approaching the plays through their stories, he described the levels of complexity and organic unity possible in various forms of narration, from the simple " and then" type to the story which satisfies our need for "pattern" in itself, and finally the "parable," that kind of story in which character, story, and diction are inseparable and combine to express an eternal truth. Such a story is the parable of the prodigal son, and Shakespeare achieves this form in *King Lear.*

Relating Shakespeare's art to the social, economic, and intellectual revolutions of the time through the figure of the new man, the Machiavel, Prof. Danby traced this theme from the slaying of Henry VI to the final tragic statement in *King Lear.* His changing conception of the Machiavel is reflected in the characters who must "kill the king," Richard, Brutus, and Hamlet, developing from perplexity at the paradox to the acceptance of the "divine comedy" in *Hamlet.* In *King Lear* Shakespeare refuses to have Edgar contaminated, so that patience and the "religious affirmation" of perfect goodness in Cordelia is his most profound reconciliation to evil.

An Approach to Producing Shakespeare

Nevill Coghill, Exeter College, Oxford

To lay the theoretical foundations for his production ideas, Mr. Coghill developed Coleridge's explanation of the way the imagination uses "images" to convey thought and feeling. The work of art is an expressive harmony demanding continuous attention in order that the image may unite with emotion and intuition to recreate the poet's meaning in a new unity. The story, the characters, and the discourse must be examined to decide on the significant total effect which is to be conveyed.

In *All's Well That Ends Well* Mr. Coghill sees Helena as a "child of grace" who saves the king and redeems the reluctant sinner Bertram. The liturgical diction and morality structure support this interpretation, which can be expressed visually by a decor based on Holbein's romantic purity and dignity. *As You Like It,* essentially a play of contrasted ideas and moods revolving around the concept of romantic love, is most appropriately presented in the style of Boucher or Wateau. Rejecting allegorical "modernizations" of *Troilus and Cressida,* Mr. Coghill analyzed the themes of love, war, and politics which intertwine with the main conflict. In *The Winter's Tale* he suggested that the reason for Leonte's jealousy is that Hermione is obviously pregnant in the first scene, and showed how this is explicitly stated in the dialogue. He described in detail how the "miracle" of the living statue might be accomplished, and justified the often criticized bear and an even more extensive use of the figure of Time as necessary links between the two worlds which the play presents.

The Tragic Drama of John Ford

Clifford Leech, University of Durham

Prof. Leech distinguished the quality of Ford's drama by showing that suffering, not action, is its moving force. His "poetry of the ideal court" extoles an aristocratic code of endurance, and in the early prose and poetical works we find an almost Calvinistic doctrine of salvation.

Tis Pity She's a Whore is infused with the typical Jacobean intellectual tension between the exultation of man's potentialities and the recognition of his mortal limitations. The static nature of Fordian drama becomes apparent in a unique cultivation of the moment which defies the natural limitations of the stage by its attempt at a spatial mode of perception. "Death," Prof. Leech observes, "gives a final immobility to the group of figures."

The Broken Heart presents a consistent imaginative world where the inevitable is accepted with calmness and authority. It is the visionary fulfillment of a "special kind of human aspiration." Again in *Perkin Warbeck* Ford shows how "nobility may be worn" despite adversity. "The greatest writers," Prof. Leech concluded, "are convincingly valid on every level. In Ford, we *must* look beyond the surface effect to see his work as the complete expression of a certain vision of life."

MACBETH AS GANGSTER

The American gangster version of *Macbeth* strangely enough, was filmed in England (*Cf. SNL, V*:3:21 where its director Ken Hughes quoted producer M. J. Frankovich as saying, "We gotta make this film with courage." When the critics read this they wrote that "courage to the point of foolhardiness" was shown. Another wrote: "boring, silly, vulgar and squalid." The directors did derive some comfort from one critic who thought the film had "horrid fascination." (*Cf. New York Times,* Nov. 20, 1955, p. 5, Sect. X.)

Dissertation Digest

COMPLETED DISSERTATIONS

Edited by
Neille Shoemaker, Baldwin-Wallace College

A Preface to Websterian Tragedy: A Critical Study of the White Devil and The Dutchess of Malfi, Travis Miller Bogard, Princeton University, 1947, pp. 348.

The author, first of all, makes a study of Webster's reputation as a dramatist. His reputation was originally based on a comparison with Shakespeare. Thus, Webster was considered inferior as a dramatist, but a satisfactory poet. It is perhaps a chief service of this thesis to show that Webster is a skilled playwright who knew the requirements of the stage and who is modern enough to be presented today. Webster emerges as a master craftsman who is no longer a minor dramatist. Next, the author makes a study of Webster's development of character. The chief point is that his characters do not "develop" as do Shakespeare's, but instead, maintain throughout the play their essential and identifying characteristic. It is Webster's business to see that his principal characters keep this one chief characteristic that makes them different from other characters. Part of his character portrayal is based on his use of satire with tragedy. It is the author's opinion that Webster is a master in blending satire and tragedy. Webster's characters are made to defy the forces that would destroy them. This technique is contrasted with Shakespeare's method of character development.

* * *

The Creative Photographer As Exemplified In The Shakespearean Theatre At Antioch College, Donald A. Hutslar, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, 1955 pp. 232. (Submitted for the M. A. degree.)

Though this thesis is concerned primarily with photography of the theatre, there are 105 illustrations of interest to Shakespearean enthusiasts. The photographs are not essentially documentary, but attempt to capture the atmosphere of the theatre as well as the dramatic essence of the characterization.

So many photographers disregard the fact that the actor is not merely a subject in himself, but often is expressing an emotion of an entirely different nature having no relationship to the immediate photographic situation: this is the "dramatic essence" that should be registered in a photograph. The photograph should be of, say, Othello, in all the vital intensity of Othello; after the impression of Othello has been registered, then the actor playing the part becomes apparent. The photographs must be a living characterization of a particular part, not merely of the actor *disguised* in a part. It becomes the photographer's job to literally *capture* the actor's illusion while that illusion is being created.

There must be a sympathetic understanding between the actor and the photographer as well as mutual respect for each other's art. Above all the photographer must be able to *see*, for the camera merely reflects his vision.

DISSERTATIONS & WORKS IN PROGRESS

Edited by
William White, Wayne University

DISSERTATIONS & WORKS IN PROGRESS Shakespeare Stage Costume from 1600-1950, Chez Haehl (Scottsbluff, Nebraska), University of Denver.

The purpose of this thesis is to report the costumes used in stage productions, in the United States and England, of Shakespeare's plays from his day to 1950. Special emphasis is placed on the periods and influences of the Duke of Saxe-Meiningen, Planche, Granville-Barker, Poel, R. E. Jones, and Lee Simonson.

John F. Sullivan. Shakespeare and the Concept of Authority. University of Michigan. Director: G. B. Harrison.

Digests of: CRITICAL REVIEWS

Henry Alden, Librarian, Grinnell College

Traversi, Derek. Shakespeare: The Last Phase. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company. 1955. $4.75.

"Readers who have enjoyed essays on Shakespeare published by Mr. Traversi in Scrutiny, and who know his pre-war . . . *Approach to Shakespeare*, are likely to put down this sensitive study of the four late romances with a faint but real sense of disappointment . . . . It arises partly from the fact that a point of view which twenty of thirty years ago was struggling . . . to be attended to . . . has now become something like an orthodoxy . . . . We all know now. . . .that a play by Shakespeare is a dramatic *poem*— linked together . . . by a . . . unity of theme, tone, imagery, language. We are alert for recurrent symbolic patterns, and aware of the importance in the four plays Mr. Traversi is considering of the theme of loss and recovery, estrangement and reconciliation, and of the father-daughter relationship . . . . Our disappointment rises partly from a feeling that what he finds is very much what he has been taught (no doubt by excellent masters) to find . . . .He brings out very vividly what might be called a Christian spirit that does . . . seem to inform these last plays. But has the appeal of that spirit perhaps made him . . . (especially in the cases of *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*) overestimate their place in the canon?"

Anonymous *Times* (London) *Lit Sup* No. 2,772 (March 18 '55), 162

A Common Ailment

"A college professor in Ohio burst out: "How can I teach Shakespeare? My students' reading level is Peter Rabbit." "

(From "Are Our Children Learning to Read," condensed from *This Week Magazine* in *Reader's Digest*, Sept. 1955, p. 169.)

• *Hardin Craig's*

Shakespeare Program

• AN INTRODUCTION TO SHAKESPEARE
725 pages $2.50 list

• THE CRAIG SHAKESPEARE
21-Play Edition
1200 pages $5.50 list

• THE COMPLETE WORKS OF SHAKESPEARE
1137 pages $7.00 list

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

Chicago Atlanta Dallas New York Palo Alto

Speaight, Robert. Nature in Shakespearean Tragedy. London, Hollis and Carter, 1955. 15s. [Macmillan, New York]

Mr. Speaight's book expresses in a "lively and . . . . critical . . . way . . . the view that when you strip a few of the gaudier outward trappings from an Elizabethan, you find underneath them a man of the Middle Ages . . . . Shakespeare's profoundest feelings about life . . . were, in a medieval sense, orthodoxly Christian . . . . Mr. Speaight . . . uses Shakespeare's treatment of the ideas of nature and grace as a clue to the moral structure of six of the greater plays, but he does not ride this leading idea to death, and some of his pleasantest things are 'asides. ' " His "is the tone of a man of the theatre who is also a man of the world . . . . He brings his whole sensibility, as well as his sound theological knowledge, to the consideration of the plays." Although demonstrating that "theological knowledge is becoming a growingly important tool for the Shakespearian critic," he never lets it become a substitute for the proper critical instrument, the total intelligence and sensibility."

Anonymous *Times* (London) *Lit Sup*, No. 2,783 (July 1 '55), 367

"Fifty years ago a discussion of 'Nature in Shakespeare' would have meant a catalogue of his observations of non-human nature (the russet-pated choughs, etc.); nowadays it would be conducted in terms of The Great Chain of Being, the Apology for Raymond Sebond, the semantics of the word 'nature' in Renaissance literature, and so forth.... Mr. Speaight has written six essays on Shakespeare, making in his title the claim that the 'Nature' business is his main theme; actually this is scarcely the case, as he makes too little attempt to state clearly what Shakespeare's views on Nature were likely to have been, and at times wanders off the subject altogether . . . . However, I do not want to put anyone off this book, which is very enjoyable; people with a long experience of acting and producing Shakespeare always have something to say which the others have missed."

John Wain *Spec* No. 6,629 (July 15 '55), 100-1

Hoffman, Calvin, The Murder of the Man Who Was "Shakespeare." New York, Julian Messner, 1955. $3.95.

"This season's candidate as 'the real Shakespeare' is Marlowe of the mighty line. The idea of *him* as the gentle bard makes one gasp.... Did he wither and grow sweet? Or should we reappraise Rosalind, Cordelia and Miranda as Marlovian superwoman...? The case for the gentle Marlowe is simple. He was not slain in 1593 as the records attest, but whisked out of circulation by his compromised lover Sir Thomas Walsingham. He lived on incognito to write the plays of Shakespeare.... The argument is unencumbered by anything resembling factual evidence or critical perception. It is a bright idea, springing full-armed from the head of Calvin Hoffman."

Alfred Harbage *N Y Times Bk R* (June 12 '55), 1 & 10-1

"It can hardly be expected that in a work of fictionalized approximation the author should be so pedantic as to provide page references to his authorities, a list of works consulted, or even an index, but if Mr. Hoffman expects to be taken seriously by students he must at least play the game according to the rules. Until he can produce some definite and verifiable evidence that someone saw Marlowe alive after May 30, 1593 his case for Marlowe's authorship of Shakespeare's plays is not worth examination."

G. B. Harrison *Sat R* XXXVIII:28 (July 9 '55), 16

AN ITINERANT PLAYGOER

Frances D. Davis, Oklahoma College for Women

[*Professor Davis spent an enviable summer visiting most of the American festivals. SNL regrets that it can only print brief portions of her remarkable impressions.*]

Yellow Springs, Ohio— June 11: Antioch— June 11: Antioch Area Theatre

I found the stage structure of rather stark simplicity— "Constructivist Elizabethan" offering maximum opportunity for fluid movement and minimum need of clap-trap. The various levels and entrances certainly invite wide ranges of movement and offer possibility of exciting visual climaxes. In high moments of the plays one supposes that there is no awareness of the stage, as such, but the actors themselves create the situation and become living scenery. This, it seems, would permit the rarest playwright of them all to dominate at all times and speak directly to the minds and hearts—and funny bones of his 20th century audience.

Stratford, Connecticut— July 14: American Shakespeare Festival

The theatre is impressive, the auditorium is impressive, the scenery and costumes impressive, but all of the ardor and passion and money which had gone into this marvelous heart-stirring adventure seemed not yet to have found their true channel and expression.

However, one could but feel a sense of gratitude to all those who had given so generously of themselves, their talents and their money to this venture; coupled with a high hope that the lessons of a perhaps too rushed beginning may lead on to an inspired second season with a renewed faith in William Shakespeare's power with an audience — once he is given a chance to speak his piece without too much self-conscious assistance.

Toronto, Canada— July 26; Toronto, The Earle Grey Co.

They managed here to evoke something near to a real Elizabethan atmosphere in a charming quadrangle of Gothic buildings and lovely trees.

A modified Elizabethan set had been placed against the gray stones of one of the buildings, and above it gleamed stained glass windows and the buttresses of the top floor of the building.

The cast managed the rather long, stretched-out entrances well, never allowing them to slow up the action as they might have done under less capable direction.

The setting was charming, the actors dedicated, and the audience enthralled.

This festival has, like most of the others, started with merely "some actors, two boards, and a passion", but it is now quite evidently the darling of the Toronto public.

Stratford, Canada— July 27-28: Stratford Shakespearean Festival

The Canadian town envelopes you at once in hospitality. The bannered streets, the Festival posters, prepare you for what is to come.

The Tent in which the plays are given excites wonder and admiration. One is surprised at the impression of grace and intimacy which is achieved in spite of its size.

The Stage gives free play to all of the exciting action which genius has devised for it, but it does play its own role in each performance and unlike the Antioch version, one remains conscious of it as an integral part of each production.

The Action takes place in two thirds of a circle. The tent entrances are used throughout the plays. This makes the audience a part of the action, helps to build excitement to a fever pitch and allows for a pageantry not otherwise possible.

One disadvantage of this semi-round staging in so large an auditorium, is that it necessitated constant moving about on the part of the actors in order not to slight any part of the audience. This was greatly disturbing to my theatre companion and it did certainly rob some scenes of their inherent quality.

Tyrone Gutherie's disregard for tradition often calls attention to itself but is always interesting and refreshing.

Ashland, Oregon— Aug. 9-10: Oregon Festival

Ontario's civic welcome was repeated here. Not a citizen of Ashland or surrounding area but considers himself and herself a reception committee of one.

From the moment you leave the box office and step through the gate, 'till curtain time you are caught up into the charming spirit that pervades this place. Women in costume greet you with words of welcome and a program. You pass on to a booth in charge of a charming person who sells you a Royal Dalton Toby Jug.

A trio of young singers in costume comes to stand before you and sing English madrigals unaccompanied, which is no small feat. They then move on to another group. The walls around you are brilliant with lighted banners. A bugle sounds, the lights dim, and the play is on. The ground slopes toward the stage; you are surrounded by people who have traveled from all over the continent to share in this phenomenon.

Here is an honest direct approach to the plays, nothing startling, nothing revolutionary, —here truly "the play's the thing". You do not expect great acting, you do not expect grandeur or astonishment; you do expect to spend a pleasant, profitable, and sometimes exciting evening with Will Shakespeare and this is what you get. Long live Angus Bowmer and his "Oregon Shakespearean Festival!"

San Diego, California— Aug. 30: Old Globe Festival

Situation charming. The theatre—so far as I know—is the only one now in existence which was planned and built to be a true Elizabethan playhouse. Only recently has the interior been changed to present either proscenium or Elizabethan productions.

Dancing on the green for "good Queen Bess" before the plays is designed to transport the audience back into the bard's own time and prepare them for an evening with him.

* * * * * *

This pilgrimage to Shakespearean Festivals offered a wide range of experiences and proved that William Shakespeare is perhaps more truly alive to-day than he was in his own age. The possibilities of production were as varied as the people and imaginations that produced him; the places of production as varied as the differing terrains and situations in New England, in a Canadian village or campus, in the Oregon mountain-ringed valley, in the Eucalyptus groves of California. The "Wooden O" became an imposing theatre of South American teakwood, a Gothic Quadrangle, a Chautauqua ring, and at the last the charming replica of a theatre of the dramatist's own time. I must confess to a preference to the last one, for with something like magic you are here transported to the 16th century, to the first Elizabeth's England, to Shakespeare's own sort of theatre. You feel the spirit of "the groundlings"—you think you may run into Ben Jonson. You wonder if the playwright himself may speak to you from the stage.

It is undefinable, it is eerie, it is something like magic. You surrender yourself to it and walk out into the California night still wrapped in an Elizabethan dream. You have become a conscious part of the stream of History and you begin to sense the oneness of time. It is the same feeling I experienced in the replicas of the Globe planned and built by Thomas W. Stevens for the Century of Progress, the New York Fair, the Dallas, Cleveland and San Diego Fairs. It is a step backward in the right direction!

[For several years Prof. Davis has been planning and raising funds to build a replica theatre on her campus. With the added inspiration of this unique pilgrimage, she hopes to say "I lived to see . . . the building of my fancy."]

A New Spotlight on the Shakespearean Concept of Nature

Now, the famed Shakespearean critic, Robert Speaight examines one of the dynamic ideas in Shakespeare's mind and craft— and brilliantly illuminates his incisive search in . . .

NATURE IN SHAKESPEAREAN TRAGEDY

By Robert Speaight

In these six provocative essays, Robert Speaight traces the Shakespearean idea of Nature and Grace in **The Tempest, Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, King Lear** and **Antony and Cleopatra.**

Considering the recurrent motif from many distinct angles, he sees it as the Divine Law incumbent on man if he wishes to avoid ruin— and also as that baser, primitive force enticing him to evil. It is sometimes the voice of conscience and sometimes the beckoning of sin. In masterly fashion, Mr. Speaight follows the current of Shakepeare's mind from a tiny sparkling clue to an illuminating thesis.

179 pages **$3.00**

What Was Shakespeare's Philosophy?

This question is an important one; yet Shakespearean criticism has, on the whole, evaded it. Now, a new critical study reveals his theological views and throws a fresh light on his works. . .

THE SLAVE OF LIFE

A Study of Shakespeare and the Idea of Justice

By M. D. H. Parker

Miss Parker's stimulating argument is that in Shakespeare's plays, and particularly in the ideas of justice they reveal, there is a profoundly Christian philosophy at work. She discusses the theological background of the Elizabethans, analyzing the plays, and examining the historical and internal evidence for believing that Shakespeare was actually a Catholic in sympathy and doctrine.

"Absorbing. . . .her case is a strong one, and is well and learnedly argued!"

—Time and Tide

264 Pages **$3.75**

wherever books are sold, or write

The Macmillan Company

60 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK 11, N.Y.

Columbia Studies in Shakespearean and related matters, 4 recent books . . .

☐ **English Stage Comedy: English Institute Essays, '54 $3.50**
☐ **ROSENBERG: Leicester, Patron of Letters $5.25**
☐ **FRAME: Montaigne's Discovery of Man $3.50**
☐ **DAVIS: George Sandys, Poet-Adventurer $4.75**

and some studies of continuing interest . . .

☐ CRUTTWELL: The Shakespearean Moment $3.75
☐ DeGROOT: Shakespeare and the "Old Faith" $3.50
☐ HARBAGE: Shakespeare's Audience $3.00
☐ HYDE: Playwriting for Elizabethans $4.00
☐ JOHNSTON: Ben Jonson: Poet $2.50
☐ JOSEPH: Shakespeare's Use of the Arts of Language $3.75
☐ MEADER: Courtship in Shakespeare $4.00
☐ SCHOENBAUM: Middleton's Tragedies $4.50
☐ STIRLING: The Populace in Shakespeare $3.00
☐ WALLACE: Fletcher, Beaumont & Company $4.00
☐ WIELER: George Chapman: The Effect of Stoicism upon His Tragedies $2.75
☐ YODER: Animal Analogy in Shakespeare's Character Portrayal $2.50

FACSIMILE TEXTS

☐ JONSON: Epigrams $3.00
☐ SHAKESPEARE: Sonnets $1.25

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
Box 151 · 2960 Broadway., New York 27
Please send me the books checked. I enclose $_____ Charge my established account_____ Charge company or institution _____
NAME _____
ADDRESS _____
CITY _____ ZONE __ STATE____

Review of Periodicals:

L. C. Knights on "Historical Scholarship and Interpretation"

Professor L. C. Knights of the University of Bristol does not feel that historical scholarship is unprofitable to the reader of Shakespeare, but he does find the claims often made for scholarship as against criticism excessive; he fears that there is "a danger of substituting accumulated 'knowledge about' for a living responsiveness." Virgil K. Whitaker's *Shakespeare's Use of Learning: An Inquiry into the Growth of his Mind and Art* is cited by Professor Knights as one of the books of the "historical school." He declares that many of our modern Shakespeare scholars are like Mr. Whitaker in treating the tragedies as "the working out of . . . principles," or the illustration of "philosophic concepts." Such an attitude leads to a failure of the imagination. We should rather start with our own direct experience of Shakespeare's plays and work back "to what most deeply nourished them in the thought, mental habits, and tradition of the time." He then cites Lascelles Abercrombie's "Plea for the Liberty of Interpreting" and calls attention to its insistence that a work of art can only be judged in the light of what we ourselves find there. Great critics of Shakespeare will always fail to agree about the exact meaning of Shakespeare. Shakespeare's work exists "only in individual apprehensions which themselves, in some sense, contribute to its being."

Professor Knights concludes by giving historical scholarship a place. He observes that information about stage conditions, dramatic conventions, the basic contemporary meanings of some words are necessary preliminaries to criticism; that we need to know something about the reading and listening habits of Shakespeare's first audience; and that we should be acquainted with "the traditional moral philosophy which nourished without confining his imagination." But such "historical" study should not have had as its ultimate aim the restoration of renaissance meanings. If we can avoid this danger "we shall be the better equipped to see Shakespeare's work for what it is: a unique creation, nourished by the complex living thoughts that we call tradition, but with such depth of life that its essential meanings need to be elicited afresh in each generation." ["On Historical Scholarship and the Interpretation of Shakespeare," *The Sewanee Review*, LXIII:2 (Spring 1955), 223-240.]

THE CRITICS' SHAKESPEARE

"Lest one good custom should corrupt the world"

Clarence L. Kulisheck, Humboldt State College

Two salient and closely related facts about the present literary scene emerge from the rapidly growing body of literature on the imagery of Shakespeare's plays. They are: (1) that sometime during the last quarter century or so a shift in aesthetic sensibility was accomplished as radical as the similar shifts occurring during the last half of the seventeenth and the last quarter of the eighteenth centuries; and (2) that a new species of literary criticism, originally highly controversial if not actually suspect in academic circles, has persisted until it now bids fair to become the dominant critical mode of our time.

This particular school of critical thought was the first called "new" by John Crowe Ransom in a famous statement made several years ago. Although this epithet still is used, a more accurate designation today is "analytical criticism." This school holds in theory and professes to demonstrate in practice that the proper study of literature is the literary text itself. It stresses above all other possible considerations a rigorously applied system of rhetorical analysis. Perhaps the most controversial proposition implicit in this method is the idea that the literary work is of primary — if not indeed exclusive — interest as an organically complete and self-sustaining construct. Hence the great emphasis placed upon patterns of imagery and their relevance to "total meaning."

The New Climate of Opinion

Now these developments have colored our estimates not only of certain modern writers currently most in vogue such as Eliot, Pound, Joyce, Kafka, and Faulkner but also of established authors of the tradition such as Donne, Milton, and Shakespeare. The effects of these developments already are far reaching. It might even be urged, for instance, that the general climate of opinion today is perhaps more receptive to the Shakespeare of William Empson or Robert Heilman or L. C. Knights than to that of, say, Elmer E. Stoll. Or so at least the increasingly frequent protests against the limitations of the historical critic's conception of Shakespeare would lead us to believe. There is more than a little evidence already, in fact, of a tendency in the peripheral areas of some circles to relegate Professor Stoll's Shakespeare to a respectable but neglected shelf alongside A. C. Bradley's, a development hardly imaginable twenty years ago.

Conversely, the work of the assiduous Caroline Spurgeon has achieved of late a sort of backdoor respectability. For the methods, though not of course the outrageously extended conclusions, of this early cataloger of images are standard equipment for the new Shakespearean criticism. Twenty years ago the mere mention of Miss Spurgeon's name was the signal for gales of ironic laughter in academic circles. Her endless numerical analyses and her far fetched biographical interpretations of dramatic images were repeatedly cited as the classic example of scholarship gone off its trolley. Now of course the biographical fantasies of Miss Spurgeon and the total meaning constructs of the analytical critics are obviously poles apart, but both types of study derive from the same premise — that the key to whatever meaning the critic is looking for is to be found primarily in the imagery of the play.

Whose is the Real Shakespeare?

A new pattern of sensibility is here then, perhaps to persist for the customary hundred years or so, and the still very voluble resistance to this new pattern is a characteristic transitional phenomenon. Now what does all this mean in terms of the new Shakespearean criticism? If, as Professor Knights tells us, it is true that the essential meaning of Shakespeare's work must be "elicited afresh in each generation," then the Shakespeare of this generation is perhaps best defined as that elicited by the analytical critics. And thus we come back, exasperatingly enough, to the forever asked and ultimately unanswerable question of just whose Shakespeare is, after all, "the real thing."

But a more fundamental question also persists. Did the new criticism effect the shift in sensibility, or is it itself an effect of that shift? Perhaps the very persistence of the question is another of those symptoms of a time of transition. [*Professor Kulisheck called for greater harmony in critical circles in a College English article in* 1953. (*Cf. SNL, II* 6. 53)

VINDICATING THE HISTORICAL APPROACH

Virgil K. Whitaker, Henry E. Huntington Library

[COMMENTS ON "ON HISTORICAL SCHOLARSHIP AND THE INTERPRETATION OF SHAKESPEARE" BY L. C. KNIGHTS]

In accepting an offer to comment on Professor L. C. Knights' essay (and using three times the space offered), I am interested in vindicating the historical approach to understanding Shakespeare. When Professor L. C. Knights selected my *Shakespeare's Use of Learning* (Huntington Library, 1953) - which has many limitations of which I am all too well aware - he perhaps did it an honor which it does not merit.

I find it hard to discuss Mr. Knight's essay for I do not understand his notion either of Shakespeare's creative activity or of the reader's response to a play, and I do not agree with his notion of the critic's function.

Shakespeare, I take it, experienced life with a fullness possible only to a man who possessed both intensity of imagination and acuteness of intellect. But he interpreted and ordered his emotional reactions and his imaginative insights, even for himself, in terms of traditional interpretations of human conduct and traditional ways of arranging thought. He judged human conduct--often, I suspect, automatically--in terms of moral principles that were largly traditional, but were also his own in the sense that he had come to accept them emotionally as well as intellectually. These traditional principles and habits of thought the historical scholar tries to elucidate as he finds them in Shakespeare, assuming that they help to reveal Shakespeare's insights and that understanding those insights is necessary to the reader's full awareness of the play. Mr. Knights seems to assume a dichotomy between imagination and thought, emotional and rational statement in both writer and reader. This I cannot find in Shakespeare--or, for that matter, in my own experience. To say that "the dimension of depth, the personal vibrancy" of Shakespeare the creative artist "prevents, or should prevent, us from speaking of *Lear* or *Macbeth* in terms of the application of a formula for tragedy of moral choice' " (p. 226) seems to me like saying that we must doubt the depth of a friend's love affair if he describes it in conventional terms or observes the formulae of polite correspondence in writing his first love letter.

The Fusion of Mechanism and Insight

A play is obviously much more than its structure, just as poetry is more than its paraphrasable content. But this is obvious, and it is nonsense to imply that isolating principles of structure inhibits us from appreciating Shakespeare's unique insight into human nature, his powers of imagination, or his superlative skill in using the resources of rhetoric and poetics as he understood them--nonsense partly because these principles so obviously did not inhibit Shakespeare, whose creative activity we are trying to share. The point is that he felt life, in its tragic aspects, as a moral struggle and adapted his dramatic mechanism to this experience of life. This fusion of insight and mechanism liberated his creative powers, especially since the basic formula had slowly evolved out of the needs of other dramatic artists who saw life substantially as he did. Pointing out this formula and its metaphysical background may also help to liberate the reader from the frustration of trying to experience fully something that he does not understand or finds confusing.

The Imagination Stimulated by Traditional Concepts

Mr. Knights, in other words, builds his case against the historical approach partly by falsifying my position. He implies that I "see his [Shakespeare's] imaginative exploration as though it were merely the application of already formed concepts" (p.226). It would be more nearly accurate, although still oversimplifying, to say that I see his imagination as powerfully stimulated by traditional concepts and his poetic artistry as using these concepts, in turn, to help organize and express his apprehension of life. In opposing this view of Shakespeare's creative activity to Mr. Knights' "personal vibrancy," whatever that may mean, I am merely opposing my assertion to his. I hope shortly to complete another book--once again historical in approach--exploring the sources of Shakespeare's tragic technique both in dramatic tradition and in his attempts to reconcile his view of the nature of man with his understanding of the end of tragedy. I will be under no illusions, I hope, that I have explained the unique excellence or the full measure of his art. But I see no evidence of conflict between Shakespeare the thinker and Shakespeare the poet. Falsifications of Shakespeare inevitably occur in works of historical scholarship; they result, however, from the personal limitations of the scholar rather than from the technique that he uses (especially, I might add, when cited out of context; *cf.* Mr. Knights, pp. 228-9, with *Shakespeare's Use of Learning, p.* 300).

The Poet Couples the General with the Particular

Shakespeare himself, I am sure, would have dissented from Mr. Knights' emphasis upon the personal aspects of his art. The end of playing, he says, is "to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature." "Mirror" and "nature" are both terms that the historical scholar needs to interpret; and the phrase means, as I hope to show, exactly what Sidney means by saying that the poet "coupleth the general notion with the particular example"— that is, the poet must relate his particular dramatic action to relevant principles derived from his metaphysical scheme: for Shakespeare the laws of nature. If Shakespeare did not have in mind this grand scheme as well as lesser schemes of organization in writing, he ignored not only the dramatic heritage of the moralities and of Seneca but also the rhetorical training and practice of his own day. Mr. Knights says of phrases of mine embodying this point of view: "Do not these phrases make the plays seem to be more schematic, more deliberately intellectual, less exploratory, imaginative and creative, than they actually are?" (p. 225) This brings the issue to focus. My book is about Shakespeare's learning, not his imagination; but to me the plays seem not only schematic and intellectual but also imaginative and creative. I see no reason why they cannot be both, why Shakespeare's intelligence and his imagination need be at war. Mr. Knights exemplifies the anti-intellectualism so characteristic of today, for he values imaginative intensity but bridles at intellectual control.

To Those Who Have Forgotten to Send in RENEWALS

We Hope this Reminder is Timely

We Serve All Year: We Ask to be Remembered but Once

(Two year renewals, at least, would be appreciated)

A Superior but Fallible Shakespeare

The historical approach should do more, however, than illuminate Shakespeare's milieu and his artistic method. It should also remind us that Shakespeare was a man in the theatre—better than his fellow dramatists, but not infallible. *Troilus and Cressida* was, so far as we have evidence, a failure in its own day, and its subsequent record has been bad. But Mr. Knights seems committed to the fallacy of the Romantic critics that a play by Shakespeare is *per se* good, and the fault, if any, lies in us. My exposition of the ideas in *Troilus and Cressida* is revelant and sound, he writes, "but the play is, after all, something more than the dramatic presentation of philosophic ideas, and it is the play as a whole—the play as an imaginative structure, permeated and not simply as it were buttressed by thought—that determines how we shall take the ideas that it contains." (p. 227) But no assertion by Mr. Knights against the consensus of critical opinion will make the play the whole or the imaginative structure that it so obviously failed to become. I was trying to account for this failure, and my hypothesis was that Shakespeare let himself become bogged down in the presentation of ideas for their own sake instead of using them as means to a dramatic end. Ironically, what Shakespeare, on my reading, did do in *Troilus and Cressida* is what Mr. Knights accuses me of thinking that he did in *Lear* or *Macbeth*—applying "already formed concepts" without a "central dynamic" that dominates and informs them. The contrast which I drew between *Troilus* and the great tragedies was intended to guard against the very oversimplification of my position into which Mr. Knights seems to me to have fallen.

The Critics' vs the Personal Shakespeare

There is perhaps a more fundamental difference still between the historical critic and the modern. The former has far more faith in his reader. None of the writers to whom Mr. Knights refers, including myself, would claim for an instant that he was presenting the whole of Shakespeare. I can perhaps provide a little more of the background that the reader needs, and I may be able to give him new insights into how Shakespeare went about writing a play. Occasionally, as a long-time reader of Shakespeare, I may be able to supply perceptions that have escaped him. But I expect him to possess sensitivity to Shakespeare's power of imagination and his command of language. I also expect him to work out for himself that personal interpretation which is his own, not in the sense that it falsifies the original or historical meaning, but in that it is enriched by his own experience and draws emphases from his own needs. Naturally I have such an interpretation, and it is supremely important to me. A part grows out of my study of Shakespeare and his background; this is historical and public, and, granted its validity, it may be of value to my readers. But another part is personal and involves such private experiences as a mental image of Lady Macbeth derived from one of my high-school teachers; this is supremely unimportant to other people and might, in fact, prove far worse than historical background as an impediment to their understanding of Shakespeare.

REVIEW of PERIODICALS

GESTATION OF THE BACONIAN HERESY

Louis J. Budd of Duke University reviews the progress of the Baconian heresy between 1860 and 1890 as a means of coming to grips with the thought of that period. His thesis is that the heresy was an inevitable outgrowth of the intellectual climate of the time, with (1) its faith in inductive science and evolution as the keys to social salvation, (2) its inability to establish a cause-and-effect relationship between the supposedly superficial actor Shakespeare and the profoundity of the Shakesperean plays, and (3) its admiration for Bacon as canonized founder of the religion of science. Professor Budd reviews Delia Bacon's career and shows how natural it was that her *The Philosophy of the Plays of Shakespeare* (1857), though read by few, should meet with general approval, arouse the sympathies (if not the acceptance) of Emerson, Elizabeth Peabody, and Hawthorne, and make a convert of Whitman's defender William D. O'Connor. Through O'Connor's statement of the case in a "Note" to *Harringtons: A Story of True Love* (1860), Nathaniel Holmes was converted. *The Authorship of Shakespeare* (1866) by Holmes established the heresy as fulfilling the emotional needs of the new faith in inductive science. Tracing the rise and decline of the heresy through Morgan's *The Shakespeare Myth* (1881), Donnelly's *The Great, Cryptogram* (1888), O'Connor's *Mr. Donnelly's Reviewers* (1889), Whitman's vacillations, William James' speculations, Mark Twain's *Is Shakespeare Dead?* and James Phinney Baxter's *The Greatest of Literary Problems* (1915), he views the progress of the heresy as a valuable reflector of the "sinuosity of the ideas that underlie an age . . . . In Baconianism we see nineteenth-century premises which lured the gullible on to absurdity, and we see a faith in method which led to intellectual madness." ["The Baconians: Madness Through Method," *The South Atlantic Quarterly,* LIV:3 (July 1955), 359-368]

IRELAND NOT GUILTY

In his biography of Shakespeare (1843, p. 49) Charles Knight indicates that he knows who fabricated the two impostures, Shakespeare's Catholic Testament of Faith and a spurious drawing of New Place, which John Jordan contributed to Malone's 1790 edition of Shakespeare. It is generally agreed that Jordan was not himself the forger. Knight does not name the forger, but he describes him, and Leonard Schwartzstein thinks the description fits George Steevens, particularly in view of the similarity between this description and a description Knight later made of Steevens in his *Studies in Shakespeare* (1849, p. 550). Though Knight has not proved Steevens to be the man, Mr. Schwartzstein amuses his readers by pointing out how blind to his suggestions later writers have been. John Pym Yeatman in *The Gentle Shakespeare; A Vindication* (London, 1896, p.201) suggests that Knight meant "Dr. Ireland," a term which might apply either to Samuel or William Henry Ireland, though neither was ever Dr. Ireland. John Henry De Groot in *The Shakespeares and "The Old Faith"* (New York, 1946, p. 95) says that Knight probably meant William Henry Ireland, "a contemporary of Jordan." Henry Mutschmann and Karl Wentersdorf in *Shakespeare and Catholicism* (New York, 1952, p. 395) repeat this conjecture, including the information that William Henry Ireland was a contemporary of Jordan. The importance of checking one's sources is shown by the following: Ireland (1777-1835) was a comtemporary of Jordan (1746-1809), but Ireland "was born seven years after the discovery of Shakespeare's testament and was only 13 years old at the time of its publication." ["Knight, Ireland, Steevens, and the Shakespeare Testament," *Notes and Queries,* New Series II:2 (February 1955), 76-8.]

SHAKESPEAREAN SEMANTICS

Miss Hilda Hulme points out that "for the intrepretation of such forms of our earlier literature as are composed primarily in the spoken language, the evidence of *O. E. D.* may be supplemented both from without, from unsearched sources of regional English, and from within, through an awareness that the written record may give only a faint indication of a strongly rooted spoken usage." By research in these sources of regional English and by a close examination of the shifts and expansions in word-meaning within the dramas, she offers detailed glosses on a number of unusual words. As a truncated example of the glosses she gives, Macbeth's *trammel* may be cited: "If th'Assassination / Could *trammel* vp the Consequence," (I.vii.3): Not only does this word mean "to entangle or fasten up in a net," but it has significance and special application in Tudor English as "to bind up (a corspe)." ["Shakespeare and the *Oxford English Dictionary.* Some Supplementary Glosses," *RES,* n.s. VI (April 1955), 128-140].

SHAKESPEARE'S USE OF LE MACON'S DECAMERON

In the opinion of Herbert G. Wright there is evidence that Shakespeare may have based *All's Well That Ends Well* upon Antoine le Macon's French translation of the *Decameron* rather than upon "Giletta of Narbona" in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure.* In support of his hypothesis he examines the evidence for supposing that Shakespeare read French and data from the plays pointing toward Shakespeare's use of le Macon rather than of Painter. He concludes (1) that the features of *All's Well* "are at least as well accounted for by the text of le Macon as by those of Painter," and (2) that acceptance of his hypothesis has implications for discussing the problem of how Shakespeare "became acquainted with the wager theme in *Cymbeline.*" ["How Did Shakespeare Come To Know the *Decameron?*", *Modern Language Review,* L:1 (January 1955), 45-48

SHAKESHAFTE AS SHAKESPEARE

Alan Keen, co-author of the *The Annotator,* pursuing "the necessary, if severe, task of bringing certainty to the 'surmises' of its title-page", offers new evidence in "the problems of Shakespeare's northern apprenticeshrip". The will of Alexander Houghton of Lea, Lancashire, who died in 1581, refers to a "ffoke [Fulke] Gyllome" and a "William Shakeshafte" (Shakeshafte being a varient name used for Shakespeare's grandfather Richard in the Snitterfield manor records.) E. K. Chambers thought it probable that these men were players. Keen finds in the records of the Chester Midsomerday pageant a payment to Thomas Gyllome (also mentioned in the will) for "daunsing at Mydsomer", and cites from *The Rolls of the Freemen of the City of Chester* the entry "Foulk Gillam s. of Thomas Gillam of Chester embroiderer". " . . .from which it is clear that the two Gyllomes, father and son, were both guild-players, and can be identified with Shakeshafte's fellows in Alexander Houghton's company at Lea Hall, Lancashire". Houghton commends Ffoke Gyllome and Shakeshafte to the service of Sir Thomas Hesketh, from whose players Shakespeare could have gone very easily into the service of Lord Strange (Keen quotes Chambers in support of this idea) and then to the London theatrical world. Mr. Keen concludes by pointing out that the Hesketh players were at Knowsly, the Derby seat, in Lancashire, at Christmas in 1587. If Shakespeare was among them, he most certainly met John Salisbury there whom he later commemorated in *The Phoenix and the Turtle.* ["Shakespeare's Northern Apprenticeship", *Times* (London) *Literary Supplement,* Nov. 18, 1955, p. 689.]

HAVE YOU SENT IN YOUR RENEWAL?

DEVELOPMENT OF SHAKESPEARE'S TRAGEDY

A study of Shakespeare's development of characters fit for tragedy by Travis Bogard considers some interesting probibilities. Had Shakespeare contented himself with the techniques of *Richard III,* and had his impulses not overruled his sense of artistic propriety, *Richard II* would have been a better play, but the great tragidies would have been at a farther remove. In *Richard II* Shakespeare began to move in a way that none of the Jacobeans followed; it is here, in fact, that Shakespeare first became himself.

To the time of *Richard III,* Shakespeare's possible models and Shakespeare himself had written almost entirely explicit drama. *Richard III,* in short, is not conceived in terms that enable him to claim an audience as Hamlet or Lear claims it.

Only with the aid of implicit suggestion can a playwright represent the inner reality of spirit essential to somewhat passive characters whose part is more to suffer than to act. This means Shakespeare seems to have stumbled on when he reached for some image to suggest the agony of a man betrayed and had Richard II compare himself audaciously with Christ. Again, when he had Richard break the mirror before Bolingbroke, Shakespeare began fully to suggest the reality of suffering in his hero, which reached a climax after the deposition ceremony. In the short lines and their silences at Richard's request, "Then give me leave to go," Shakespeare projected a matured character with a reality that he had not before been able to achieve. ["Shakespeare's Second Richard," *PMLA,* LXX:1 (March 1955), 192-209.]

JOHNSON & WARBURTON

Arthur Sherbo examines the copy of Warburton's edition (now owned by University College of Wales) which Dr. Johnson used in compiling his *Dictionary* and here points out the use made of it, supplementing a previous description of this edition by Miss A. Cuming (RES, III, 208-212). There are some words underlined in Warburton, Dr. Johnson's usual method of directing his amanuensis to copy them, which did not get into the *Dictionary,* probably because of a lack of space. Other words are underlined in notes found in this edition: for example, "painted cloth" in "The Rape of Lucrece" is explained by Theobald's note, and his explanation is cited under "to Paint v. a. (2)" in the *Dictionary.* A few other words are quoted as from Shakespeare when actually they are from other writers quoted by Warburton: "stallworm" is cited as if it were used by Shakespeare, but it is used by Fairfax in a note in the edition (VII, 117, 4). ["Dr. Johnson's Dictionary and Warburton's Shakespeare," PQ, XXXIII (1955), 94-96.]

Critical Reviews:

Amphlett, H. Who was Shakespeare? A New Enquiry. With an Introduction by Christmas Humphreys. London Heinemann, 1955. 21s.

"Miss Amphlett ventures into the thorny paths of Shakespearian controversy with a restatement of the seventeenth Earl of Oxford's claim to authorship of the plays and poems . . . . Mr. . . . Humphreys asserts that it contains many new facts and is an original attempt to prove the Oxfordian case; the author herself modestly refrains from laying stress on her own discoveries, but is clearly well read both in the period and in the life and character of De Vere. She writes well and persuasively . . . . The worst fault is a certain carelessness of detail . . . . All unimportant slips, no doubt, but they shake a reader's confidence in the accuracy of less familiar matters."

Anonymous *Times* (London) *Lit Sup* No. 2,783 (July 1 '55), 371

Shakespeare's Roman Plays: & Other Subjects

A report on the Seventh Shakespeare Conference sponsored by The University of Birmingham, The University of Manchester, The Shakespeare Memorial Theatre, and The British Council held at The Shakespeare Institute, Stratford-upon-Avon September 4-9, 1955.

Shakespeare's 'small latin" - how much?

J. Dover Wilson, University of Edinburgh

Commenting upon Ben Jonson's verses prefaced to the First Folio, Professor Wilson thought that Jonson's friendship with Shakespeare made him exaggerate in his praise of Shakespeare's art, yet even so he was unable to allow Shakespeare learning. Professor Wilson then reviewed the fluctuating opinions of the centuries concerning Shakespeare's education and classical learning leading up to the present critical position, notably represented by T. W. Baldwin and F. P. Wilson, which accorded Shakespeare a tolerable ease in reading Latin.

He did not accept this view or the belief that Shakespeare had much classical learning. In the Folio texts of *Coriolanus* and *Antony and Cleopatra,* both of which are thought to have been printed from foul papers, there were a number of misspellings of proper names, presumably authorial; in *Julius Caesar,* a text not from foul papers, there were no such errors. Further, it was suspicious that many of the prominent classical references were to be found in the early plays of disputed authorship. There were surprisingly few Latin quotations in Shakespeare when compared to the numbers found in the smaller canons of Marlowe and Greene, and again it was to be noted that even these few all occurred in disputed plays.

In admitting the frequency of classical allusion in Shakespeare's plays, Professor Wilson thought that before one looked for Latin sources, a thorough examination should be made of all the English poems of the mid-sixteenth century. It was well known, for example, how intimately Shakespeare knew the texts of *Romeus and Juliet* and Golding's translation of the *Metamorphoses.* In an analysis of the Lorenzo - Jessica dialogue at the beginning of act V of *The Merchant of Venice,* he showed that none of the classical material went directly back to Latin sources; it was a distillation of Shakespeare's imagination from a blend of medieval legend, Chaucer and Golding.

Professor Dover Wilson did not deny Shakespeare some nodding acquaintance with Latin texts, but could find no evidence that he read Latin with ease; until 1600, at any rate, his sources were mainly second - hand.

Principles of Introduction

Una Ellis-Fermor, University of London

Professor Ellis - Fermor's paper had special reference to editions of Shakespeare's plays designed for undergraduates and older pupils in schools. The introduction to such an edition should endeavour not merely to increase the student's knowledge of a particular play but also his understanding of Shakespeare as a whole; to provide him with the background and method which would facilitate a sound approach to the appreciation of any other of the plays. Since the editor would not be expert in all the branches of knowledge involved in the interpretation of a play he should present a careful summary of the findings of scholarship.

In discussing the question of date the editor should stress the importance of chronology for our understanding of the growth of Shakespeare's dramatic art. Shakespeare's use of sources introduced us to his workshop, therefore it was essential to provide a transcript of those sources, or at least a full description; there should be conveyed a sense of the transmuting power of Shakespeare's imagination in working upon his reading and experiences. Professor Ellis-Fermor thought it part of the editor's task to present an interpretation of the play, but after analysis it was essential to restore the play to the student as a total imaginative experience. Some treatment of setting, social and political theories would impair the necessary historical perspective, whilst the discussion of structure, character and imagery should endeavour to show their intimate relationship in defining and colouring each other.

It was possible for the editor, by his own example, to prompt in the young student an attitude of mind which would eventually mature to a rich and balanced appreciation of artistic creation and purpose. Finally, Professor Ellis-Fermor said that an introduction such as she had in mind, demonstrating the subtle interplay of many branches of knowledge in the single purpose of understanding a play, could be invaluable in transmitting a sense of the unity of all learning, a concept which was being lost today in our pigeon-holed school syllabuses and university specialization.

Discussion: Chairman, G. I. Duthie, University of Aberdeen

The principal question of debate was whether an editor should give his own critical interpretation of the play, or present the opinions of others. Dr. Bradbrook thought that we should guard the student from the reading of too much criticism, and in agreeing Professor Ellis-Fermor added that a short conspectus of criticism of the play should be sufficient to satisfy the curiosity of the student, and that this should be followed by the editor's own interpretation. Professor Danby and Professor Charlton both felt that any sort of conspectus was likely to be a mere porridge of opinion. The danger of such a conspectus of criticism, said Professor Sisson, was that young students might receive the pronouncements of great critics as somehow final and authoritative; it was much better to let the editor give, as it were, an anonymous interpretation. Both he and Dr. Brooks pointed out that the editor of the play was in the best position to give a sound interpretation. In strong opposition was Professor Lever, who felt that the editor should be only a chairman of opinion, and Professor Alexander, who said that we should always cite the opinions of others since we never knew what particular train of thought would touch off the imagination of a student. Both Professor Dover Wilson and Mr. David favoured a highly provocative introduction.

In reply to Professor Waith's suggestion that the apparent completeness of the Arden individual editions of plays might have a stultifying effect, Professor Ellis-Fermor said that the introduction should not give the impression of a complete picture but rather show the student new horizons. This principle would hold good for characterization, a point raised by Professor Carrere.

Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Romans

Terence Spencer, Queen's College, Belfast

Mr. Spencer thought it was a remarkable tribute to Shakespeare's historical imagination that, at a time when the estimate of his learning was low, Dryden, Tate and Pope all praised the veracity of his picture of Roman times. The 18th century commentators were offended by the minor anachronisms, but they recognised that Shakespeare had given a serious portrayal of Roman morals and manners. It was significant that he turned from English histories to Roman themes for serious political analysis. Like his contemporaies Shakespeare used Roman history as a means of expressing political ideas but, setting aside his treatment of the mob, he drew his Romans with a gravity and dignity seldom found in other 16th century interpretations. William Fullbecke in *An historical collection of the continuall factions of the Romans and Italians* (1601) drew the appropriate moral and political lessons from the welter of sedition, ambition and tyranny which he apparently conceived to constitute a great part of Roman life. The life of Bassianus in *A Chronicle conteyning the lives of tenne Emperors of Rome* betrays the same attitude, and both this and a chronicle by Richard Reynolds indicated a prevailing interest in Imperial Rome (because suited to the Elizabethan zest for monarchical didactics) rather than Republican Rome. In the light of these ideas, *Titus Andronicus* would appear to present a picture of Roman life more characteristic of 16th century opinion than that of Shakespeare's three great Roman plays. Its curious mixture of political institutions was in strong contrast to the truth of the later plays in this respect.

Mr. Spencer pointed out that in *Julius Caesar* and *Antony and Cleopatra,* Shakespeare was dealing with figures that had already been dignified in European literature, but the selection of *Coriolanus* must have been the result of a search in the massive Plutarch. *Coriolanus* was astonishingly right in details (perhaps under the stimulus of Jonson) and it was a question whether there was anything comparable for accuracy of spirit and manners in Renaissance literature. *Catiline* and *Sejanus* perhaps exhibited greater learning, but Jonson lacked Shakespeare's insight and discrimination in the use of his materials, and was often naive in characterization. Shakespeare had created the only picture that many of us have of ancient Rome, and in this respect for most schoolboys *Julius Caesar* was far more important than Caesar's commentaries.

The Producer's Treatment of "Hamlet" and Aspects of Humanism in Shakespeare's Works.

Nikolai Okhlopkov, Vice-Minister of Culture, U. S. S. R. Director of Mayakovsky Theatre, Moscow

[The paper was read by Mr. George Rylands]

The study of Shakespeare was today a most valuable contribution to Soviet culture and Mr. Okhlopkov said that his writings were an inspiration to Russian thought and dramatic art. As with all the great tragic writers, so with Shakespeare, it was our duty to unite the minds and souls of men all over the world through the highest aspirations of man's creative genius. Shakespeare was not didactic, nor did he provide an answer to the evils of the world against which he inspired us to make unremitting war, but always he promised hope for the final victory of humanism whatever immediate death and sorrow had to be endured. This was true of all Shakespeare's tragedies, especially so of *Hamlet.*

Seeing the world as a prison in which all the good people are plunged in grief and darkness, Hamlet's ideal was the enfranchisement of the human spirit. He dreamt of a world of harmony and reason and saw beyond the wickedness of mere individuals to a universe of corruption and tyranny which he must fight. First he had to fight with himself, against the desire to escape from hideous reality, against initial pessimism and abstract humanism. This wavering did not arise from apathy or lack of conviction, but because he feared to take any action not in accordance with human ideals. Though he thirsted for action he was too far removed from the narrow practicality of a Cassius or a Richard III to find this easy. Mr. Okhlopkov insisted that Hamlet must not be regarded as a pessimist. He saw also the potential greatness of man and, though often biding his time, he was always in control in the relentless struggle against evil. He dissembled his deep love for Ophelia and sent her away, not because she was like Gertrude, but that she might escape the corrupting influence of Claudius and his adherents. In the person of Hamlet, striving to burst the prison walls, was expressed the unconquerable will of man to vanquish the forces of unreason and reaction which for centuries had fettered him. There was victory in death, for the beacon had been lit - so Hamlet asked to be reported aright by Horatio that the struggle might go on.

In Mr. Okhlopkov's production this conception of the tragedy was given visual expression in the huge prison gates which, closed across the stage at the beginning of each scene, opened on a kingdom of tawdry brilliance. Feeling that the music must combine both masculine and feminine elements he chose that composed by Tchaikovsky for *Hamlet.*

(To be Continued)

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Since starting our Digests of Critical Reviews, SNL has had less space to devote to Current Bibliography. An attempt will be made to announce new books as soon as they are received. The comments will describe the book and its contents rather than offer a critical review. Recent issues will be included as well as new issues until we are up to date.)

SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY. Edited for The Shakespeare Association of America by James G. McManaway, VI:3 (Summer 1955), 247—372.

"TIMON and the Conceit of Art," W. Moelwyn Merchant, University College of South Wales and Monmouthshire.

The Reverend Mr. Merchant shows that the role of the painter and the poet in *Timon* has an "organic relation" to the major theme of the play. Not " 'money and self-interest', " but the problem of appearance and reality as they are involved in Timon's acceptance and later in his rejection of "art as a means of revelation," is the theme.

"Cast-off Copy for the First Folio of Shakespeare," Charlton Hinman.

Dr. Hinman, having established the fact that the First Folio was set "by formes rather than by successive pages," suggests 1) that "some of the textual pecularities in plays that were set from much-edited copy" sometimes resulted from a compositor's "efforts to compensate for inaccurate casting off"; and 2) that hereafter "the habits of the several compositors who set the First Folio" should be studied with a realization that setting by formes "made special demands" upon these compositors.

"The case of the Decapitated Cast or THE NIGHT-WALKER at Smock Alley," Allan Stevenson.

Dr. Stevenson's discovery in a copy of Fletcher's *Night-walker* of a manuscript cast of characters marred by a binder's cutting off of "the beginning of every name, except perhaps one," nevertheless enables him by comparing it with a manuscript cast for *Julius Caesar* and with "several actors' names in common" in "a manuscript prompt book" of John Wilson's *Belphegor* used in the Smock Alley Theatre, Dublin, to identify "at least twelve of the sixteen or seventeen names," to establish "the period of the *Night-walker* cast," 1670-1676, and to furnish many "more conclusions than were implied in the initial problem."

"The problem of JULIUS CAESAR," Ernest Schanzer, University of Liverpool.

Interpreting *Julius Caesar* as not the "simple play" its use as "a favorite school text" makes it seem to be, Mr. Schanzer, notes the "polarity" of critics' views about the play, and observes that Shakepeare's presentation of Caesar was probably done in the interest of dramatic suspense." "Since on our estimate of Caesar depends to a large extent our view of the justification of the entire conspiracy, the whole drama is thus kept within the area of the problem-play."

"McKerrow's Editorial Principles for Shakespeare Reconsidered," Fredson T. Bowers, University of Virginia.

Professor Bowers, examining R. B. McKerrow's *Prolegomena* as providing "suggestions for the presentation of an edited text," points out that it "fails to concern itself with more than the simplest category of Shakespearian texts and even within that range is no longer a guide that can be trusted by an editor of Shakespeare, or of the general Elizabethan drama."

"Adversity and the Miracle of Love in KING LEAR," Paul N. Siegel Ripon College.

Professor Siegel, points out the dependence of Gloucester's and Lear's sufferings on "the ideas on the value of adversity" in Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophinae* and in "the Christian humanist works that followed in its tradition." He shows that for these redeemed characters adversity brings "the miracle of love" and providing "more than punishment," supplies the "purgatory which burns away their previous selfishness."

B.A.

Alexander, Peter, Hamlet, Father and Son, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1955, pp. 189, $2.40. (Pub. in U. S. Feb. 24, 1955.)

The five chapters in this book were originally written, as the Lord Northclife lectures delivered at the University of London in 1953. The author took as his theme the Olivier *Hamlet* film and its controversial prologue which called it "the tragedy of a man who could not make up his mind." Alexander's book is friendly controversy showing what the producers might have cited as evidence and then citing the opposing position. The author believes that Shakespeare's vision and inspiration raised his tragedy to heights over simple *hamartia* (tragic flaw). Shakespeare placed his individual stamp on the story to such an extent that Hamlet becomes a complete man. "The play dramatizes the perpetual struggle to which all civilization that is genuine is doomed. To live up to its own ideals it has to place itself at a disadvantage with the cunning and treacherous." The dust jacket has an interesting comment from Chekhov's advice to the actors of a Moscow *Hamlet*. "I require that even the most unimportant actors, before they venture on the stage, should acquaint themselves with the literature about Shakespeare, so that when the actor says, for example, "A quiet night, Bernardo!" everyone may at once feel that he has read eight volumes." This volume should make nine.

Buxton, John, Sir Philip Sidney and the English Renaissance, London, Macmillan, (New York, St. Martin's Press), 1954, pp. 284, $4.00. (Pub. in U. S. Dec. 12, 1954.)

This book is a study of the patronage this "general Maecenas of learning," and his sister and her sons extended to the literary men of their time. It is an interesting study that fills in many details of the Elizabethan milieu of the time of Shakespeare, and the influence of Sidney in sponsoring the traditions which gave rise to Shakespeare. The book retails the statement by Fulke Greville in which he desired "to be known to posterity under no other notions than of Shakespeare's and Ben Jonson's master." The explanation of this enigmatic statement we offer as challenge to a doctoral candidate or a budding Hotson. To Philip and Mary Sidney, Buxton attributes "the chief glory" of the creation of the "New Poetry." "The personality of Philip Sidney shaped the literature of his countrymen, as it set an example for them to cherish."

Richard III, Edited by J. Dover Wilson, (The New Shakespeare), New York, Cambridge University Press, 1954, pp. lxiii-280, $2.75. (Pub. Jan. 20, 1954).

Although other editions continue to come from the press, none of them can really eliminate the need to have Dover Wilson's comments by one's side. Professor Wilson avails himself of Greg's statement that "readings in which the folio and quarto agree are those 'most vulnerable to criticism and open to emendation'," and accepts the challenge to the extent of including "some sixty readings in my text which depart both from folio and quartos (i.e. they are emendations in the fullest sense of the word), and from other editions." Many of them, he admits, are revived from the 18th century. The text and date are discussed, over twenty-five pages are devoted to discussion of the sources, and additional space given to the style, character and plot, and stage history. The complicated question of the copy for Q1 (1597) and F1 (1623) is discussed in a twenty page appendix. A hundred pages of notes, and a genealogical table of the York and Lancaster families complete the volume.

THE FUNCTION OF STRUCTURE AND IMAGERY IN SHAKESPEARE'S LAST PLAYS

F. David Hoeniger, University of Toronto

The structure of Shakespeare's last plays or romances is almost unique in Elizabethan drama and, like the structure of Shakespeare's other plays but unlike that of the tragi-comedies of Beaumont and Fletcher, its main function is to give shape to a vision of life. This function is sometimes cross - illuminated by the imagery. If the imagery itself of the last plays seems to hint less clearly at the core of their thought or meaning than that of *King Lear*, it is because in them the action has taken over some of the functions performed by the imagery in earlier plays.

Four Distinguishing Features

Even some of the more obvious features of the action distinguish *Pericles, Cymbeline,* and *The Winter's Tale* from most contemporary plays: the action of each involves events over a period of many years; each has a double-threaded plot of two generations who after long separation are reunited in the end; in each, divine powers intervene at crucial moments; and each introduces near the middle a sudden and startling change in time or in place which qualifies our perspective of the entire action. In The *Tempest* the unities of time and place are strictly observed, but the nature of the action is nevertheless closely similar.

To present actions of such scope convincingly and effectively within "the two hours' traffic of our stage" must have been an extremely difficult challenge even to the mature Shakespeare. In the light of this fact, the partial failure of both *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* should not surprise us. In them Shakespeare experiments with adaptations of literary forms he had not used before: the miracle play (or rather a hybrid form between the miracle play proper and romance) and Alexandrian romance. As one studies the four last plays, it becomes apparent that Shakespeare gained valuable experience while writing *Pericles* and *Cymbeline* which helped him to discover the fables and master the forms which would adequately embody his final vision — in *The Winter's Tale* and *The Tempest*. For structurally *The Winter's Tale* is closely related to *Pericles, The Tempest* to *Cymbeline*. In each case, the later play displays a simplified and dramatically more effective form.

Romance and Reality

The vision of life of the last plays is at once wider and more serene than that of the tragedies. It comprehends levels of romance as well as of reality—both part of a larger view of reality. Though the good man encounters evil and is subjected to suffering and terror, d i v i n e Providence will restore him to joy. During his trials he acquires patience and moral wisdom, the kind of wisdom which comes only slowly, and only after he has been face to face with despair. Providence acts partly through the younger generation, usually female, which represents man's hope of renewal in life, partly through supernatural means (e. g. Diana's Vision in *Pericles,* the roles of Jupiter and Soothsayer in *Cymbeline,* of Apollo and Paulina with her "lawful" magic in *The Winter's Tale*). Such an action is of course mainly inward, requiring many years. The vision faces suffering squarely but points beyond it. It not only reflects on noble action (Prospero), but reveals that "there are unicorns" (*The Tempest,* III.iii.21).

[The foregoing presents the argument of a 386 page University of London dissertation completed by the author in 1954.]

THE SHAKESPEARE CLUB OF NEW YORK CITY

(Incorporated 1890)

One of America's Oldest Clubs for the Reading and Study of Shakespeare

Meetings Alternate Tuesdays, September-April

VISITORS WELCOME

For Particulars apply to the Secretary:-
Miss Rowena Meyer
214 East 25th Street, N. Y. 10, N. Y.

REVIEW of PERIODICALS

THE YALE FACSIMILE

In a review exuding thinly - veiled sarcasm, an anonymous *TLS* reviewer examines the Yale "facsimile" (he regularly uses quotation marks around the word) and finds fault with Professor Kokeritz's Preface because it over - values the text and with Professor Prouty's Introduction because it mixes fact with conjecture and worries little about summarizing "the views generally held by scholars." The reviewer fulminates against the reduction in size and the faultiness in the technique of obliterating the "show-through." The reviewer points out that large sections of pages 63, 91, 356-63, 480, 667b, and 668a are "made hideous by exaggerated show - through." Punctuation has been affected on 203b, a tear or crease affects 73a and 74b; a word is lost on 88, eight letters on 382, and a hole in page 105b disfigures 106a and permits two letters from 107b to peep through. Twenty lines of the original Folio measure "83 to 84 millimeters" [3 1/8"] as compared to "67 to 68 millimeters" [2 5/8"] in the facsimile. This reduction makes "uneasy reading" for the reviewer. Punctuation is difficult to distinguish and distortion disfigures the words on the inner margin — on page 353a for example. Because "a facsimile cannot be trusted in one place, it can be trusted in no place."

The appearance of Greg's book on *The Shakespeare First Folio* makes comparison of Professor Prouty's twenty - three page Introduction with the 500 page book inevitable. Greg's "sharp bracing precision" is not to be found. After remarking on the untenability of the "Feuillerat - Prouty doctrines about play-revision," the "unliklihood" that only bad plays have been lost, and the fallacy of the assumption that "what went on in Henslowe's slum companies went on in the more stable and prosperous companies," the reviewer regrets that ideas "generally rejected by the Scholars," should be laid before the Students. He objects to the citing of unpublished works (John Schroeder's Yale dissertation prepared under Professor Prouty's supervision) and concludes that portion of the review by declaring that "There need be no further flogging of the dead introduction to a dead "facsimile." " The reviewer concludes that Greg's book is to be preferred to Prouty's Introduction and that Sir Sidney Lee's 1902 collotype facsimile (priced recently at 25 pounds - $70) is to be preferred if a 1623 Folio is inaccessible. "Dr. Hinman's task of collating will soon be done. We must hope that the market for his facsimile has not been spoiled by the ill-timed publication of the Yale "facsimile." " ["The Shakespeare First Folio and its Problems," *Times* [London] *Literary Supplement*, Oct. 14, 1955, p. 612.]

THE YALE FACSIMILE DEFENDED

R. C. Marsh finds the *TLS* review of the Yale *F1* facsimile "marred by the anti-Americanism which so frequently weakens the judgement of persons" who, when unbiased, are usually reputable scholars. Mr. Marsh resents the fact that the reviewer did not mention Kittredge in his summary of scholarship, that Prouty's twenty-three page "Introduction" is declared "not comparable" to Greg's five hundred page book, and that Prouty is not permitted to hold views which differ from those of the reviewer. The same tendency is also revealed in the disparaging of this "valuable work on the basis of what are essentially trivial flaws and the appeal to incommensurate critera." The reviewer did not examine all the copies, Mr. Marsh declares, because pages 63, 91, 156-63 are "quite clean and legible" in his copy though the reviewer found them illegible in his. "Throughout this whole fantastic performance one sees, again and again, the desire to condemn asserting itself over balanced judgement. The value of the Kokeritz-Prouty facsimile is such that this review is not likely to affect it. What is important is that we see "reviewing" of this type for what it is, an exchange of no greater seriousness than the remarks of rival sopranos in an opera company." ["The Shakespeare First Folio," *TLS*, Oct. 21, 1955, p. 821]

GREG ON THE YALE FACSIMILE

Commenting on the review of his latest work work, *The Shakespeare First Folio*, W. W. Greg points out the reason for abandoning the facsimile to which his book was supposed to have been a preface. It had nothing to do with Hinman's work on the Folger Folios but rather with experiments conducted by the Clarendon Press which showed the impossibility of producing a "reliable facsimile at the popular price intended . . . ; . . . the Yale attempt suggests that their decision was a wise one." Greg also points out that Knight's reputed editorship of the Folio is doubtful because Knight was not in the company, apparently, until 1642, and furthermore that his habits as a scribe are missing. ["The Shakespeare First Folio," *Times* [London] *Literary Supplement*, Oct. 21, 1955, p. 821].

THE FACSIMILE AND ANTI-AMERICANISM

Replying to R. C. Marsh's attack on the October 21 *TLS* review of F1, W. W. Greg points out that it is "quite unnecessary to assume Anti-Americanism" to account for the tone of the original review on October 14. He notes that an American scholar had written him hoping that the "English reviewers would deal faithfully with its shortcomings," while assuring him that the American reviewers would do likewise. Both nations now have aired their views, he declares. The *TLS* reviewer is "entitled" to his opinion on Professor Prouty's scholarship; the facsimile is not "a valuable work" nor are its defects "essentially trivial flaws." If some copies are illegible, "that only shows how unreliable it is . . . . those responsible for it will have to reckon with the strictures of responsible American scholars in technical journals on the other side." ["The Shakespeare First Folio," *TLS*, Oct. 28, 1955, p. 639.]

In another letter, R. C. Bald of the U. of Chicago also replies to the charge of "Anti-Americanism" by referring to the *Modern Philology* review [by Fredson Bowers, *Cf, SNL*, V:4:27] and another comment on p. 270 of the summer issue of the *Shakespeare Quarterly*, by Charlton Hinman. [*Ibid.*]

STATEMENT REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF AUGUST 24, 1912, AS AMENDED BY THE ACTS OF MARCH 3, 1933, AND JULY 2, 1946 (Title 39, United States Code, Section 233) SHOWING THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, AND CIRCULATION OF The Shakespeare Newsletter published six times per year, Feb., Apr., May, Sept., Nov., Dec., at Pembroke, N. C. for October 1, 1955.

1. The names and addresses of the publisher editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher—Louis Marder, Pembroke State College, Pembroke, N. C.
Editor—Louis Marder, Same.
Managing editor—Louis Marder, Same
Business manager—Louis Marder, Same

2. The owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the name and address of stockholders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a partnership or other unincorporated firm, its name and address, as well as that of each individual member, must be given.) Louis Marder, Pembroke, N. C.

3. The known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 percent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) None

4. Paragraphs 2 and 3 include, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting; also the statements in the two paragraphs show the affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than of a bona fide owner.

5. The average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the 12 months preceding the dates shown above was: (This information is required from daily, weekly, semiweekly, and triweekly newspapers only.)

LOUIS MARDER
OWNER

Sworn and subscribed before me this 29th day of October, 1955.

James C. Oxendine
(My commission expires January 18, 1956.)

OTHELLO VS. IAGO

An anonymous correspondent of the Birmingham *Post*, an admirer of *Othello*, asks, "Which of the two parts, Othello or Iago, is the greater? Which offers the player the more exacting challenge and the richer opportunity?" An actor who plays Othello, he believes, must portray "a poetic hero who, through blind gullibility, is transformed into a monster of cruelty, even brutality—and has also to contrive that the fund of sympathy and respect which he commands at the outset is not hopelessly overdrawn." The task is made more formidable by the nature of Iago: Iago despises the high-minded creatures who prosper while he remains low; his tricks are crudely improvised; his luck is with him almost to the end. That he is able to deceive so well is unbelievable unless he is magnificently played. "The Ancient must be presented with such assurance and authority that disbelief is supended Unless we credit Iago, unless his devilish scheme convinces *us* that his plot could succeed, and that statesmen and Generals as well as gulls are understandably his victims, the play fails. Othello is no hero, but a man of straw; his fate is not pitiful, but the self-destruction of a thoughtless fool. This makes Iago the key character and his role, because so much hangs upon it, greater than Othello's. Given a weak Iago, Othello toils in vain." ["An 'Othello' Problem," Birmingham [England] *Post*, March 30, 1955.]

LOVE'S TRICKERY

John Arthos classifies *All's Well That Ends Well* as intellectual comdey analogous to such Moliere comedies as *Le Mariage Force'* and *Tartuffe* wherein the author is a philosopher in complete control of the thought that moves his characters. The "controlling attitude" of the play—"the relations of love to conquest, of pain and deceit to love, of love to begetting . . . involving the rejection of parents by children and children by parents—is termed "the comedy of generations": the play is a dramatic representation of "the strength and ambitiousness of love" in all its species. According to this view, the comedy centers not in Helena's tricking Bertram, but in love's tricking Helena into "scheming and connivance." Seen as moral history, the ugliness of this scheming is distracting. Seen as comedy, these very elements "help affirm the healing power that belongs to love, and the parallel power of forgiveness that belongs to a king and parent." Confusion is rooted in the inequalities inherent in "love and aspiration": "love and sanctity," virginity and fertility, the pure and the impure, life and death, infinite ambition and the limits of nature. The question is: can the happy ending overcome for us the ugliness of the confused elements? Professor Arthos' conclusion is that "it can, if we are able to perceive the direction of the whole of the action and the emphasis on love and virtue"— that is, if we can share with Shakespeare, "the satisfaction of innocence." ["The Comedy of Generation," *Essays in Criticism*, V:2 (April 1955), 97-117.]

GREASY GALLOWS

K. B. Danks feels confident that Shakespeare must have been interested in public hangings. He supports his belief by quoting three passages in all of which Shakespeare apparently remembers the sweat or fat left on the gibbets by its victims. He cites the following:

1. . . . grease that's sweaten
From the murder's gibbet. . . .
(*Macbeth*, IV. 1. 65)
2. *Man.* Good master porter, I belong to the larder.
Por. Belong to the gallows and be hanged, you rogue!
Henry VIII, V. 4. 4)
3. If I hang I'll make a fat pair for the gallows . . . .
(*I Henry IV*, II. 1. 66) . .

["Grease that's Sweaten," *Notes and Queries*, New Series I:8 (August 1954), 334.]

Review of Periodicals

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS
Barbara Alden; Ned B. Allen, University of Delaware; Peter Allen, WQXR, N. Y.; I. B. Cauthen, Jr., Univ. of Virginia; R. J. Dorius, Yale; John B. Shackford, Cornell College, Bibliographer

WHY FALSTAFF?

As we all know, Sir John Falstaff was once called Oldcastle. In response to an objection from the Oldcastle family, Shakespeare changed the name, and he was apparently influenced by the Sir John Fastolphe of 1 *Henry VI, a* coward who ran away before the battle began. But why did Shakespeare change the "Fastolphe" to "Falstaff" instead of to some other variant? Professor T. Walter Herbert of the University of Florida suggests, though he does not declare, that Shakespeare was punning on his own name. The Oldcastle family had insisted that the name be changed, and Shakespeare was in danger of being ridiculed for having to give in. Perhaps he decided to lessen the sting by starting the laughter himself. Professor Herbert's arguments are ingenious: 1. A staff might be a spear, of course, as the pun suggests, but it might also stand for political authority, as when Worcester in *Richard II* broke his staff upon resigning his stewardship, or a wand, as when Prospero did the same thing upon abjuring his magic. Shakespeare may have been ridiculing, or pretending to ridicule, the idea that he as a poet had power or authority over those, especially of high rank, who saw his productions. Falstaff's power over the prince failed at the end. 2. The idea that "Falstaff" is a pun is certainly in keeping with the names of the other characters in the two parts of *Henry IV*: Shallow, Pistol, Bullcalf, Mouldy, Hotspur, and Doll Tearsheet. Ben Johnson punned on Shakespeare's name, and Shakespeare himself did so in a way in the coat of arms he devised, with its proud falcon brandishing a spear. Shakespeare also punned on his first name— Will— in the sonnets. 3. The tradition that connects Justice Shallow of *The Merry Wives of Windsor* with Sir Thomas Lucy may have been connected with the idea that "Falstaff" was a pun on "Shakespeare." Shallow rebukes Falstaff with "Knight, you have beaten my men, killed my deer, and broke open my lodge." Even though we do not accept the identification of Shallow with Lucy, we can see how the identification of Falstaff with Shakespeare could have led to it. 4. The Oldcastle family's anger at the Knight's having been given their name might have been lessened by the change. Perhaps Shakespeare was saying: "If that fat character is to do any damage by belittling a name, it will be my name, not yours."

Professor Herbert also quotes from a letter to the Earl of Southhampton from his wife (1599) in which she said, " . . . Sir John Falstaff is by his mistress Dame Pintpot made father of a goodly miller's thumb, a boy that's all head and very little body, but this is a secret . . . ." The dots stand for three words inked out in the manuscript, and it has been suggested that the first two words may have been "William Shakespeare." The father of the child was probably Lord Cobham of the Oldcastle family, for according to Leslie Hotson, "cob" and "miller's thumb" are two names for the same fish. ["The Naming of Falstaff," *The Emory University Quarterly,* X:1 (March 1954), 1-11.]

AS THE RHETORICAL TWIG IS BENT...

The problem pursued by William C. McAvoy of Saint Louis University is "the relationship between Aphthonius' *Progymnamata,* Lorichius' *scholia,* and the form of the famous praise of England by John of Gaunt in" *Richard II,* II.i. 40-66. After establishing that the "guide for 'correct' theme writing in English grammar schools" was a Latin version of Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata,* with the *scholia* of R. Lorichius, Professor McAvoy demonstrates how Gaunt's encomium follows step by step the directions given by Aphthonius and Lorichius, and cites numerous analogues both in the works of other Elizabethans such as Peele and Greene and in other Shakespeare plays such as *III Henry VI* and *King John.* ["Form in *Richard II,* II i. 40-66," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology,* LIV:3 (July 1955), 355-361]

MACBETH'S TWO STEEDS

After a close review of the most significant attempts to explicate *Macbeth* (I. viii. 21-28), Robert J. Boyle, S.J., of St. Louis University argues cogently for a new explication. He divides his task into two problems. (1) "the resemblances between pity and the strange babe and between pity and the active cherubin; and the activity of pity blowing the deed in every eye until tears drown the wind" and (2) "the relationship between Macbeth's emotionless intent and his uncontrollable, ill-fated ambition." The first problem is solved by regarding babe and cherubin as images of helpless pity inspired to "violent action" by "preternatural power" reacting against the unnatural murder. The second problem is solved by identifying Macbeth's "intent" with loyalty to Duncan, the steed which would carry Macbeth to safety, but which he cannot ride with the spur of ambition, whereas the other steed—of foul murder—requires no spur. The consequent reading would be: the unnatural murder of Duncan will inspire pity to "blow the deed" in all eyes and bring "universal grief." Unfortunately, I can find no means of enforcing my resolve not to commit the murder, for I desire the kingship. Though the deed will destroy me, the steed is ready (without spur) to carry me over the obstacle (Duncan), but she "will fall on the other side of the obstacle and destroy me." ["The Imagery of *Macbeth,* I, viii, 21-28," *Modern Language Quarterly* XVI:2 (June 1955), 130-136.]

THE RIDDLE IN PERICLES

P. Goolden traces three stages in the evolution of the riddle *Pericles* I.i. In its earliest form the riddle appears in the Medieval prose romance *Appolonius of Tyre:* "Scelere vehor, materna carne vescor, quacro fratrem meum, meae matris virum, uxoris meae filium, non invenio," with Antiochus the speaker and the riddle turning on *in-law* relationships and focussing upon the husband who cannot be found ("non invenio"). Mr. Goolden demonstrates that Gower in the *Confessio Amantis* made a remarkably accurate literal translation of a corrupt Latin text of this version, but possibly without comprehending the dark complexities of the riddle's meaning. He then goes on to show how, in order to clarify the riddle for dramatic purposes, Shakespeare (or Wilkins) made the daughter of Antiochus speak the riddle and reshaped the clues "to make them comprehensible." And he concludes: The result is mercifully easier and one which serves its purpose perfectly well in dramatic context." ["Antiochus's Riddle in Gower and Shakespeare," *The Review of English Studies,* N.S.VI:23 (July 1955), 245-251.]

Psychoanalytic Shakespeareana

The August, 1955, number of *Literature and Psychology* edited by Dr. Leonard F. Manheim of The City College in New York contains an interesting eleven page Bibliography entitled "Fifty Years of the Psychoanalysis of Literature: 1900-1951." The bibliography, prepared by A. Bronson Feldman, contains twenty-five interesting items concerning Shakespeare. The list begins with an item on "Anal-Erotic Character Traits in Shylock," and ends with one on "The Hypnosis Scene in *The Tempest.*" Subscription to the quarterly is $1.00 annually.

SHAW'S VIEWS ON SHAKESPEARE

Archibald Henderson, President of the Shaw Society of America, reviews Shaw's war with Shakespeare and quotes the famous "machine-gun" attacks against the Bard. But it was not all war: in the 1880's Shaw joined the New Shakespeare Society and in a paper praised *T&C*; his "Dark Lady of the Sonnets" sought to praise Shakespeare, but it repulsed the public. In 1898 he saw Shakespeare as "unsurpassed as poet, storyteller, character draughtsmen, humorist, and rhetorician," but also as one who "left us no intellectually coherent drama . . . ." In 1900 Shaw boldly challenged Shakespeare with his preface to *Caesar and Cleopatra,* "Better than Shakespeare?" Most critics ignore the query, and for a quarter of a century "Shaw was publicly regarded as a self-professed rival of Shakespeare." But, despite his blasts, Shaw "always stood out vehemently for the production of Shakespeare's plays in their integrity." He inveighed against Henry Irving, and in his rage over Irving's production of *Cymbeline* he wrote: "With the single exception of Homer, there is no eminent writer, not even Sir Walter Scott, whom I can despise so entirely as I despise Shakespeare when I measure my mind against his. The intensity of my impatience with him occasionally reaches such a pitch, that it would postively be a relief to me to dig him up and throw stones at him, knowing as I do how incapable he and his worshippers are of understanding any less obvious form of indignity." This was the crisis, but behind the crisis lay the rejection of Ibsen in England and the refusal of Irving to produce the plays of Ibsen, of Shaw, and of other modern dramatists. Mr. Henderson once asked Shaw if he really did consider Shakespeare only derivative and thought himself the superior playwright and thinker. Shaw answered, "When I uttered this boutade (not to say blasphemy) I was really measuring Ibsen's mind against [Homer, Shakespeare, Scott]. Nobody who does not remember the impact of Ibsen in England after 1889 can understand how devastatingly he knocked out his predecessor." But what was Shaw's real opinion of Shakespeare? In 1905 he wrote, "In manner and art nobody can write better than Shakespeare, because, carelessness apart, he did the thing as well as it can be done within the limits of human faculty." ["Shaw and Shakespeare," *The Shaw Bulletin,* (September 1954), 1-6.]

SHAKESPEARE AND ESSEX

E. P. Kuhl of the University of Iowa believes that both Spenser and Shakespeare equated Hercules with the Earl of Essex. Shakespeare in *MV* has three allusions to Hercules; Bassanio regards Hercules as a symbol of valor and Essex was so regarded by the populace in 1596. An allusion to a ship Andrew in the opening scene recalls Essex's capture of the Andrew before Cadiz in 1596. *Hamlet,* moreover, refers to Hercules and his load too," which Mr. Kuhl sees as "an obvious allusion to the Globe Theatre . . . ." But, more importantly, Shakespeare had Essex in mind in an allusion to Hercules and his globe, an "Earl renowned like Hercules in popular fancy, a mighty warrior and sea-dog beyond compare . . . , a patron of greater England." ["Hercules in Spencer and Shakespeare," *TLS,* December 31, 1954, p.860.]